

LEGAL & GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

THE
PERFECTED SYSTEM
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.

Total Funds - - £10,600,000
Income, 1914 - - £1,396,000

TRUSTEES.

THE EARL OF HALSBURY.
The Hon. Mr. Justice DEANE.
The Hon. Mr. Justice YOUNGER.
ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.
CHAS. F. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.

DIRECTORS.

Chairmen.
ROMER WILLIAMS, Esq., D.L., J.P.
Barrington, The Hon. W. B. L.
The Right Hon. George Cave, P.C.,
K.C., M.P.
Chadwick-Healey, Sir Charles E. H.,
K.C.B., K.C.
Channell, The Rt. Hon. Sir Arthur
Deane, The Hon. Mr. Justice
Farrer, Henry L., Esq.
Finch, Arthur J., Esq., J.P.

Deputy Chairmen.
CHARLES F. JOHNSON, Esq., J.P.
Follett, John S., Esq., J.P.
Frere, John W. C., Esq.
Haldane, Sir W. S., W.S.
Rawle, Thomas, Esq.
Rider, J. E. W., Esq.
Saltwell, Wm. Henry, Esq.
Tweedie, R. W., Esq.
Younger, The Hon. Mr. Justice

BONUS RECORD.

| | | | | | |
|------|---|---|------|---|----------------------|
| 1891 | - | - | 36/- | % | per annum, compound. |
| 1896 | - | - | 38/- | % | " " " |
| 1901 | - | - | 38/- | % | " " " |
| 1906 | - | - | 38/- | % | " " " |
| 1911 | - | - | 38/- | % | " " " |

**WHOLE LIFE ASSURANCE AT MINIMUM COST UNDER
THE SOCIETY'S PERFECTED MAXIMUM TABLE.**

**ALL CLASSES OF LIFE ASSURANCE AND
ANNUITIES GRANTED.**

ESTATE DUTIES.

Policies are granted at specially low rates for Non-Profit Assurances, and these are particularly advantageous for the purpose of providing Death Duties and portions for younger children.

LOANS.

These are granted in large or small amounts on Reversionary Interests of all kinds and other approved Securities, and transactions will be completed with a minimum of delay.

HEAD OFFICE: 10, FLEET ST., LONDON, E.C.

The Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.

(ESTABLISHED IN 1857.)

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 18, 1915.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION, WHICH MUST BE PAID IN ADVANCE:

£1 6s.; by Post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.

HALF-YEARLY AND QUARTERLY SUBSCRIPTIONS IN PROPORTION.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

GENERAL HEADINGS.

| | | | |
|--|-----|------------------------------------|-----|
| CURRENT TOPICS..... | 739 | GERMAN PEACE PROPOSALS..... | 745 |
| THE WHOLE DUTY OF AN AMBASSADOR..... | 741 | THE GOVERNMENT LAND VALUATION..... | 746 |
| INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE WAR..... | 742 | OBITUARY..... | 746 |
| CORRESPONDENCE..... | 743 | LEGAL NEWS..... | 746 |
| NEW ORDERS, &c..... | 744 | WINDING-UP NOTICES..... | 747 |
| SEIZURE OF I.L.P. PAPERS..... | 745 | CREDITORS' NOTICES..... | 748 |
| DEFENCE OF THE REALM CASES "IN CAMERA"..... | 745 | BANKRUPTCY NOTICES..... | 749 |

Cases Reported this Week.

| | |
|--|-----|
| Great Western and Metropolitan Railway Companies v. Hammersmith Assessment Committee. Same v. Ken- sington Assessment Committee..... | 744 |
| Wooten v. Lichfield Brewery Co..... | 744 |

Current Topics.

Conscription.

AT THE beginning of the year (*ante*, p. 200) we summarized the legal position, as we conceived it, with regard to compulsory military service in this country, and we shewed that any general liability to such service which there may have been in former days has long been obsolete. Its place was taken in the time of the Stuarts by the militia, and this, also, has in practice become obsolete, or rather has been absorbed by the Special Reserve. Theoretically, indeed, there is power, by Order in Council, to revive the ballot for the militia (10 Geo. 4, c. 10, s. 2), but we are probably safe in saying that such a course would as a military measure be useless, and for practical purposes there is at the present moment no rule of statute or common law which imposes any compulsory service, whether under the popular name of conscription, or under the new name of national military service. All this, we believe, is generally recognized, and any proposition for conscription must come before Parliament as a new measure. Whether such a measure ought to be accepted or not is a very controversial question, and therefore we abstain from expressing any opinion on it, except that, like much else which has been happening in the last year, it would constitute a striking breach with the past. We have hitherto prided ourselves on not being subject, like a Continental nation, to this extreme form of State interference with the individual. If this interference is now to be permitted it will, in the view of many, be not the least unfortunate result of the war. Doubtless there are some who think military service is in itself desirable, but that has not hitherto been the prevalent opinion in this country, and whether it is prevalent hereafter will, we imagine, depend very much on the result of the war and the wisdom which decides the conditions of peace.

Hearing of Defence of the Realm Charges *In Camera*.

MANY MEMBERS of both branches of the legal profession will welcome LORD FARMOR's spirited protest against the unexpected way in which prosecuting counsel and magistrates are depriving persons accused of certain offences under the Defence of the Realm Act and Regulations of the greatest safeguard for a fair trial contained in our Constitution—namely, a hearing in public. Of course it is true that in time of war great encroachments on the liberty of the subject are unhappily necessary; the safety of the Realm has then to be first considered. Sometimes these two, like the Irresistible force and the Immovable obstacle of a certain old-fashioned school of physicists, are incompatible, and then the liberty of the subject must give way. But unless the two are

clearly incompatible, that liberty should be preserved. Now section 1 (3) of the Defence of the Realm (Amendment) Act, 1915, gives to Courts which try offences under the Act of 1914 the right to exclude the public "in the interests of national safety." Thus where spies or persons trying to obtain information useful to the enemy are undergoing trial, no one will doubt the advisability of excluding the public while secret information is being referred to in evidence. Though even in such cases, it may be mentioned, the High Court in certain recent trials at the Old Bailey did not find it necessary to hear the whole of the case *in camera*, and did not exclude the public until the point was reached when secrets might be revealed.

Expressing Peace Views.

But where journalists and politicians, who hold views as to the conduct or objects of the war which are opposed to those of the great majority in this country, are being tried under the Defence Acts for the publication of pamphlets and articles, or the enunciation of their views in speeches, it is difficult to see any reason for excluding the public at any part of the hearing. The views expressed are either stated in a reasonable or in an unreasonable manner. If stated reasonably, then, however mistaken those who hold them may be thought to be, they may fairly claim to put before the public what they think to be for the real good of the country. The suppression by secret trial of views as to State policy is something quite new. If they are stated in an unreasonable manner, then in a war in which, unlike any previous great war in our history, practically the whole of public opinion is in favour of the Government policy, it is absurd to suppose that unreasonable arguments of a few dissentients can convert public opinion to erroneous views. In either case no arguable case for suppression of publicity seems to be forthcoming. Perhaps the truth is that prosecuting counsel and magistrates alike are unconsciously and unintentionally led to confuse the needs of public safety with the prevailing feeling as to the views of the minority. However this may be, we think they are acting unwisely in asking for or granting the hearing *in camera* of such cases as that against the *Labour Leader* heard at Manchester three weeks ago and that now under trial in London. To refuse publicity to the arguments of a small minority of extremists or doctrinaires is the correct way of leading the average man to imagine that there must be something, after all, in the arguments which he is not allowed to hear. And moreover no arguments which are intended to secure the cause of peace should be suppressed. This is to adopt German methods. We trust, therefore, that the sound good sense of lawyers will rally round Lord PARMOOR now, as it did before when he protested successfully against the proposal to confer on courts-martial the right to sentence British subjects to death without the option of a civil trial.

Registration and the Revising Barristers.

WE ARE glad to be in a position to announce that Mr. LONG has met in a reasonable spirit the special claims of revising barristers, and that a compromise, better than at one time seemed likely, has been arranged. Instead of receiving 250 guineas, the ex-revisers are to receive a little less than half that sum, namely, £120, for which they are to render certain services found necessary to carry out the provisions of the Registration Acts, Parliamentary and Municipal. Under these statutes the town clerks and overseers present annually their bill of expenses in connection with the electoral rolls; these are audited by the revising barrister at the conclusion of his tour of duty, and paid by the Treasury. This year these bills still remain to be compiled and honoured, with this difference, that no expenses incurred after 31st July will be met. Where it happens, as is usually the case, that town clerks and overseers had entered into contracts with printers and other persons to get all this electoral work done for one round sum, these contracts are, by the recent Act, annulled as from 31st July, so that a *quantum meruit* for the broken period has to be arranged between the parties, and certified as just by the revisor. This work of auditing remains necessary, despite the annulment of the appointments, and, indeed, raises legal questions not usually before the barrister when he audits. We understand that it has been possible to offer

each reviser £120 owing to the public spirited conduct of those few revising barristers who are quite independent of the revising fees, and who have voluntarily abandoned any claim to compensation from the Local Government Board.

Germany and *The Arabic*.

THE QUESTION as to Germany's conduct of maritime war so far as it affects neutrals is still in debate between that country and the United States, though the course of proceedings is punctuated now and then by fresh attacks on passenger and merchant ships, like *The Arabic* and *The Hesperian*. The last document of interest is the attempted justification by Germany of the sinking of *The Arabic*. The commander of the submarine suspected that the ship was about to attack him and he promptly sank her. The German Government regret the loss of life, and in particular the death of American citizens; but "it cannot recognize the obligation for compensation, even if the commander should have made a mistake about the aggressive intention of *The Arabic*." The excuse has, we gather, not been received with much satisfaction in the United States, and the offer of Germany to submit the case to arbitration, without prejudice to the permissibility in International Law of German submarine warfare, is not likely to be accepted. The offer refers to Article 38 of Hague Convention I. (1907)—The Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. According to the Article, "arbitration is recognized by the Contracting Powers as the means the most efficacious, and at the same time the most equitable, for regulating disputes which have not been settled by diplomatic methods." It is not without significance that Article 1 binds the Contracting Powers to employ all their efforts to ensure the peaceable solution of international differences. There is a certain boldness in Germany now appealing to Article 38 to settle payment for her crimes at sea, after the manner in which a year ago she ignored Article 1 and plunged Europe into war.

The Onus of Proof.

A QUESTION which has often arisen in a somewhat different connection came before the Court of Criminal Appeal three weeks ago in *Rez v. Ward* (1915, W. N. 317). A bricklayer was arrested by the police because he was found at night in possession of a chisel and a screwdriver—two implements of a bricklayer's trade, but which are also capable of being used as housebreaking implements, as was decided in *Reg. v. Oldham* (1852, 21 L. J. (M. C.) 134). He was indicted under section 58 of the Larceny Act, 1861, which provides that whosoever "shall be found by night having in his possession without lawful excuse (the proof of which shall be on such person) any picklock-key, crow-jack, bit or other implement of housebreaking" shall be guilty of a misdemeanour. *Prima facie*, the wording of the section seems to show that, once the accused is found at night in possession of housebreaking implements, the burden of proof shifts on him, and renders him liable to conviction unless he satisfies the jury of the innocence of his possession thereof. The Deputy-Chairman at the Middlesex Sessions who tried WARD, took this view, and directed the jury that the prisoner was *prima facie* guilty. The prisoner gave evidence on his own behalf and gave a plausible explanation of his possession; but the jury, on the Deputy-Chairman's direction, convicted. Now of course the point in question is closely connected with the well-known doctrine of "recent possession" in larceny cases, that a person found in possession of stolen goods shortly after the theft must be presumed to be either thief or receiver, until he offers a reasonable explanation of his possession. But it is trite law that this rule as to "recent possession" is a mere presumption of fact, not one of law; it does not impose on the prisoner the burden of proving the innocent character of his possession; it is enough for him to offer a reasonable explanation, and then the onus of proof reverts upon the Crown. The Court of Criminal Appeal had evidently this rule in mind when deciding *Rez v. Ward* (*supra*), for they held that, after the prisoner gave his explanation of his possession of the implements, the Crown was bound to prove that his possession was in fact for an unlawful purpose. In view of this interpretation of section 58, of

course, the Deputy-Chairman had misdirected the jury, and so the conviction was quashed.

The Validity of Prize Court Rules.

In *The Zamora* (ante, p. 614) the President had to consider how far municipal regulations are binding on an International Court such as the Prize Court, sitting in one national State by the mandate of its sovereign, but administering the Law of Nations and not the common law of its accidental seat. Lord STOWELL answered a similar question in the leading case of *The Fox* (Edw. 311) by holding that, unless the statutes or orders of the municipal sovereign who sets up the Court are in their nature absolutely repugnant to the accepted principles of International Law, the Prize Court must accept them as legislative or executive interpretations thereof, and apply them to the cases it tries, even although no foreign jurists may be willing to recognize and act upon them. Sir SAMUEL EVANS followed the guidance of Lord STOWELL and added a curious gloss of his own, to the effect that no British Government would ever promulgate regulations which violated the settled rules of International Law. But this begs the question, and seems to be irrelevant. The actual point he had before him was the validity of Order 29 of the Prize Court Rules, 1914, as amended in April, 1915 (Manual of Emergency Legislation, Supplement No. 3, p. 510). The Order entitles the Crown in certain circumstances to requisition cargo (not condemned as contraband) upon a neutral ship detained on suspicion of carrying contraband. Under the Law of Nations such a requisition can only be justified by the Right of Angary, which does not extend to neutral property on the high seas. But there is, it seems, nothing inconsistent with the principles of civilized warfare in the Order, and therefore the President held the requisition to be valid.

The Whole Duty of an Ambassador.

INTERNATIONAL law is not characterized by the virtue of preciseness. Except where international documents, such as the Hague Conventions, the Treaty of Paris, and the Declaration of London, have harmonized and codified a chaos of conflicting precedents, it is never very easy to state what exactly the accepted rules are in any particular department of inter-State relations. But in nine cases out of ten some great general principle serves for guidance, and such a principle regulates the duties towards his host which the comity of nations imposes upon the guest of a sovereign State. Public interest in these duties has naturally been aroused by recent revelations as to the behaviour in the United States of the German Ambassador, Count BERNSTORFF, and the misbehaviour of the less astute Dr. DUMBA, who represents Austria-Hungary.

The whole duty of an ambassador, however, is not exactly that of a guest in private life to his host. Things are permitted to the ambassador from which a polite guest must refrain. But there is one starting point in common. When a sovereign State possesses the right of legation, i.e., the right to send and the duty to receive the accredited diplomatic representative of another sovereign State, that right is not unlimited. It must not be exercised in such a way as to foist on the hospitality of the host a guest who, in the language of diplomacy, is *non persona grata*. A proposed ambassador may be *non persona grata* for many different reasons. For example, some years ago the Honourable H. W. BLAIR, a distinguished member of the U. S. Senate, was appointed by a new President as Minister to China. But the President had forgotten that Mr. BLAIR had voted for the Chinese Exclusion Act. China, however, had not forgotten, and the Empress intimated that Mr. BLAIR's assumption of his new duties "might be detrimental to the intercourse of the two nations." A deadlock followed, which Mr. BLAIR had the good sense to terminate by a voluntary resignation. In view of incidents like this, it is now usual for sovereign States to appoint as ambassadors only persons as to whom they are assured, after previous informal inquiry, that no objection will be taken by the

State to which the envoy is accredited. This practice has a special name in diplomacy; it is known as *l'agrédation*.

But an envoy may be a *persona grata* when he is appointed, and yet so act as to cease to be such. When this happens, it is understood that the host-State has a right to request his recall. This right is not lightly exercised, and, unless an adequate reason is given, its exercise will be considered an affront to the national honour of the State which is asked to recall its ambassador. Should that State decline to comply with the request, or delay compliance by protracted negotiations, it is generally recognized that the aggrieved State has a right to take the law into its own hands without breach of international customs; it can give the offender his passports. This is a serious step, but it is not necessarily an unfriendly act, still less an informal declaration of war. It is not even a *casus belli* on which the sovereign, whose representative is thus summarily shewn the door, can claim that international intercourse has been interrupted by the act of the host. But it is apt to lead to war.

The classical case is that of Lord SACKVILLE-WEST. In 1888 England had unsettled claims on behalf of certain of its nationals against the defaulting South American State of Venezuela. It was believed that Lord SALISBURY intended to collect these debts, as Mr. GLADSTONE had collected those due by the Egyptian Government not quite ten years before—by the menace of naval operations if necessary. The United States was up in arms against what its citizens regarded as a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. A presidential campaign was raging in America between the Republicans, who supported Mr. BLAINE, and the Democrats, who supported Mr. CLEVELAND. Both parties denounced equally the conduct of England. In these circumstances a private American citizen, a naturalized subject of British origin, wrote to the British Ambassador, Lord SACKVILLE, saying that he wished to support the party least unfavourable to England, and asking Lord SACKVILLE his opinion as to which he should support; or rather Lord SACKVILLE received a letter purporting to come from such a person. The letter was in reality a trap sent by some Republican politician who guessed what the reply was likely to be. Lord SACKVILLE fell into the trap. He sent a reply, marked "Private," which stated that any American party which favoured England would lose popularity, but that the election of President CLEVELAND would be the more favourable to an understanding between the nations. Of course, the politician who sent the letter published it in the hope of discrediting President CLEVELAND, and an outcry at once arose in America against Lord SACKVILLE. His plea was that the letter was marked "Private." The British Foreign Office made an effort to defend him. The result was that the American Secretary of State, Mr. BAYARD, thought it best to dismiss Lord SACKVILLE summarily, and at once sent him his passports.

From this example it will be clear what is the general nature of an ambassador's duty to the sovereign State whose guest he is. It is his duty to refrain from interfering in the affairs of the host-State—just as a private guest is not supposed to take sides in, indeed must ignore the existence of, disputes in the family of his host. Put conversely, it is his duty to restrict his activities to the immediate amenities of his own existence and the performance of his recognized mission to his host. That mission is threefold. He must act as a negotiator when differences arise between the States. He must protect the interests of his own nationals. He must observe the economic, military, naval, and political situation of the host-country, with a view to avoiding possible future collisions between them. This last right is not exactly that of a guest in the house of a private host, but it is well recognized in International Law (Stockton, at p. 205). Indeed, it is generally held to justify the practice of espionage in the host's military affairs; the naval and military attachés of an embassy have a recognized right to receive and pay for confidential reports by spies. But here the right, in any case an invidious one, stops abruptly. The envoy must not step outside his duty of "observation" and practise any interference in the affairs, industrial or otherwise, of the State which receives him. Emphatically, if his State is at war with a third party, he

must not use the territory of the neutral, to whose sovereign he is accredited, as a base of military or naval operations, direct or indirect, against the belligerents. It is because Count BERNSTORFF is alleged to have habitually overstepped these limits that he is in peril of being told by President WILSON and Secretary of State LANSING that to them he is no longer a *persona grata*; and it is because Dr. DUMBA actually did so that he is leaving America.

International Law and the War.*

It is too early yet to attempt any final examination of the effect of the present war upon International Law, and we do not suppose that Mr. PHILLIPSON would make any such claim for his very able and interesting book. Since the beginning of August, 1914, he says in his Preface, International Law has been subjected to severe trials, and he has endeavoured to ascertain to what extent it has emerged from its ordeals inviolate, to what extent homage has been honourably paid to it, in what respects it has suffered hurt, and its behests have been disregarded. The number of violations to be examined is large, but nearly all these he lays to the account of Germany, and to explain them he pays special attention to the theories of the law of war and of International Law in general advanced by German writers, to the views held in German military circles, and especially to the practices of the German forces; and he tries to shew that these theories, views and practices have not been suddenly adopted to meet the exigencies of the present occasion, but are rather the natural consequences of the general attitude that has long been assumed by the governing authorities and military enthusiasts of Germany.

Sir JOHN MACDONELL touches a similar note in the introduction which he has contributed. "International Law," he says, "is passing through a crisis. According to some opinions it has come to an end." But this view he regards as erroneous. "It is no more true than was a similar judgment often expressed during the anarchy of the Napoleonic Wars." And he distinguishes between the German breaches of treaty and her military excesses, which are a reversion to barbarism; and the breaches of old rules which may be ascribed "to the altered conditions of warfare; to changes on land and at sea; to new methods of attack and defence; to the use of new weapons and munitions; to the altered relations of combatants to non-combatants and of belligerents to neutrals; to changes in trade; to the introduction of steam and the increased size of vessels; and to the greatly heightened facilities for the conveyance of goods from one country to another." All these things have tended to a revision of old rules. "There has been an appalling reversion to barbarism; there has also been growth, rapid, unexpected, and still incomplete." As to the outcome of the present conflict, Sir JOHN shrinks from adopting the proposal to place adequate force behind an international Supreme Court, and on this to base respect for International Law. He fears that the proposal might lead to more wars than it would stop. But he looks to neutral States to be more ready to express disapproval of breaches of law. "If there is to be no Armed Neutrality—if that means frequent interventions with consequent hostilities—there should, if possible, be Organized Neutrality, every neutral State claiming the right to express, if practicable, in concert with others, the condemnation of conduct abhorrent and detrimental to all; the world never again seeing foul deeds done without protests from governments looking on." He sees a recognition of this right in the United States *Lusitania* Notes, which contain a protest in the name "of the rights of humanity" against the crimes committed on the high seas by German vessels of war.

To turn to the substance of the book, Mr. PHILLIPSON commences with an examination of the causes of the war, and justifies Great Britain's intervention on the ground of the necessity of maintaining the "Balance of Power" and of enforcing the guarantee of Belgian neutrality. The reference to the Balance of Power is perhaps not very happy. It is the cause rather than the justification of war, and it may be hoped that hereafter the expression will disappear. We are probably all agreed that the compelling cause of intervention was the unprovoked attack on Belgium and France, and the object of the war now is the vindication of public law and the destruction of the German military menace. Mr. PHILLIPSON discusses at some length the difference between the international guarantees in the cases of Belgium and Luxemburg. The former he regards as "joint and several," and therefore to be enforced by one guarantor against breach by another; the other was expressed to be a collective guarantee, and it is assumed that no guarantor is bound to intervene alone. This of course reduces the guarantee to nonentity and the

statesmen who have made these distinctions have simply played with legal terms. In fact, the resulting liabilities depend on general principles, and this we pointed out at the beginning of the war (58 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 751). In enforcing a guarantee States, like creditors, have to consider the real interests at stake, and if Luxemburg alone had been involved, it probably would not have been worth while. As a State it is too insignificant, and moreover it made no appeal for protection, it simply entered a formal protest. The case of Belgium was different. That State was made neutral, not alone in its own interest, but in the interest of neighbouring countries, and the violation of its neutrality involved danger both to France and Great Britain. Mr. PHILLIPSON correctly sums up the matter when he says that "so far as Great Britain was concerned, intervention was necessary in order to fulfil her word of honour, and safeguard the public law of Europe, to protect her own interests, and to vindicate the rights of Belgium."

Mr. PHILLIPSON's account of the origin of the war also includes a chapter on the theories of CLAUSEWITZ, of TREITSCHKE, and of BERNHARDI, and these theories may have contributed to the German readiness for war and to the methods which she has adopted in carrying it on; but this is rather a matter of speculation. What were the influences on the other side and how far did these theories receive countenance from lawyers? Mr. PHILLIPSON quotes at length the opposite views of BLUNTSCHLI and we have no doubt IHERING and other leading names would have been opposed to the criminal designs of the military party. Of this we shall know more when the war is over and its results come to be summed up.

Of the numerous questions which Mr. PHILLIPSON discusses we can only touch on a few. As regards alien enemies he points out, as we have frequently done, that modern usage forbids any interference with their liberty or property, subject, of course, to their good behaviour; but his account of the events and causes which have led to a departure from this usage and to the internment of civilian enemies is not very clear. We gather that he justifies it, as the Divisional Court recently did in *Liebmann's case* (ante, p. 733), on the ground of general espionage; but in a work of this kind the evidence of such espionage should have been stated. The treatment of these unfortunate persons, both in England and Germany, appears to have become progressively more severe, and while it is useless to discuss the matter now, it will doubtless be considered hereafter how far the procedure has been due to real state emergency and how far to international prejudice and misunderstanding.

In the chapter on the position of alien enemies in our Courts, Mr. PHILLIPSON accepts the common law rule which was affirmed by the Court of Appeal in *Porter v. Freudenberg* (59 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 216; 1915, 1 K. B. 857), that an alien enemy cannot sue. But SARGANT, J., made the first notable amelioration in the law by holding in *Princess Thurn and Taxis v. Moffitt* (59 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26; 1915, 1 Ch. 58) that he could sue if he was registered, and the Court of Appeal in *Porter v. Freudenberg* further broke in upon the common law by allowing suits against alien enemies. Again, in *The Mowse* (59 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, p. 76; 1915, P. 1) Sir SAMUEL EVANS found himself compelled to abandon the narrow rule which he was first disposed to adopt, and to allow enemy subjects to appear as claimants in the Prize Court; while the technicalities of English company law required the Court of Appeal in *The Continental Tyre Co.'s case* (59 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 232; 1915, 1 K. B. 893) to allow a British company to sue as plaintiff notwithstanding that practically all its members were German. Mr. PHILLIPSON supports Lord WRENBURY's view that this was wrong in substance, but we are not aware that any inconvenience has followed from it, nor indeed would there be any inconvenience in adopting the German rule allowing enemy aliens generally to sue. Considerations of convenience are quite the other way. But we have recognized already that the Courts have gone as far in the amelioration of the hardships of war as could have been expected, though not as far as might have been desired. The one signal mistake which they have made is in declaring all communication between civilians of the belligerent countries to be unlawful, and not merely commercial intercourse (*Robson v. Premier Oil Co.*, ante, p. 475), though Mr. PHILLIPSON seems only to notice the prohibition of commercial intercourse; but the book had left his hands before this decision.

Matter of more popular interest is contained in Chapter VIII, which discusses the German practices in the conduct of the war—practices which exclude all humane considerations where these are inconsistent with the object of the war and which have come to be known as "frightfulness." It is these practices in Belgium, in France, in Poland, and on the high seas which, according to the Allies' view, has made Germany an outlaw among nations, and has suggested to some that she will remain an outlaw for many years after the conclusion of peace. That, no doubt, is an error, and a dangerous one. If indulged in, it would make peace impossible. History shews how quickly national excesses are forgotten, and whether or not punishment is in store for the ringleaders in Germany's crimes, the common welfare will demand that the broken strands of international communi-

* International Law and the Great War. By Coleman Phillips, son, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D., Barrister-at-Law. With Introduction by Sir John Macdonell, K.C.B., LL.D., F.B.A. T. Fisher Unwin (Limited). 15s.

cation shall be quickly joined. Mr. PHILLIPSON goes into the story of the German barbarities at considerable length. The German defence is that the civil population were guilty of war crimes. Into this term we need not now inquire. It may have a plausible meaning, but its main purpose seems to be to justify excesses against civilians. The present rules against armed civilian resistance have been made by the Great Powers in their own military interest. It may be hoped that they will be revised after the war and placed on a different footing. The term "war crime," it will be remembered, was used to justify the capital sentence on Lody, and Mr. PHILLIPSON assumes, without discussion, that this was right. But of course the legality of the procedure was very much open to question, and the Government recognised this by promptly obtaining an amendment of the Defence of the Realm Act.

The concluding chapters deal with questions of maritime warfare, such as prize-law, contraband, blockade and military areas. These are matters which are still under discussion, and perhaps Mr. PHILLIPSON shows too great a tendency to assume that whatever Great Britain does must be right. It is of the essence of a book on International Law that the writer should treat his subject impartially. The conduct of Germany at sea has been infamous, but the conduct of Great Britain has not met with acquiescence from neutral states, though the objections are quite different from those in the case of Germany. It is only the enormity of Germany's crimes which has prevented a stronger protest against our own interference with neutral commerce. But much has already happened since Mr. PHILLIPSON's book was written, and its interest is not diminished by the fact that its subject is still undergoing development. After all, the great question at the end of this war will be not how to formulate again the laws of war, but how to determine boldly that war shall not recur. This can be done if the better elements in the nations now at strife are allowed to prevail.

Correspondence.

Sittings of the Court and Lawyers' Fees in the 18th Century.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Writing to Lord Carlisle in 1732 Sir Thomas Robinson, in referring to a law suit in which he was engaged, mentions that it was heard by the Master of the Rolls on two mornings, beginning at half-past eight; and that "lawyers' fees run exceeding high on these occasions—the first day the Attorney-General had 15 guineas, and Messrs. Bootle, Verney, and Willes 12 guineas, and all the rest 10 guineas apiece," see *Hist. Mag. Comm.* 15th report 101, note.

Inner Temple Library. J. E. LATTON-PICKERING.

Income Tax—War Rate.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—The maximum rate of income tax is, in consequence of the war, now 2s. 6d. in the £, but the amount payable in respect of earned income is in many cases very much below this. Every year since the earned rate has been in force a large number of taxpayers have been required to pay income tax at the highest rate, because they have neglected to claim the reduced rate before the time limit expired. In the case of persons whose incomes do not exceed £1,000 the earned rate at present is 1s. 6d. in the £, but if they neglect to make a return and to claim the earned rate before 30th September, they will be charged at 2s. 6d. in the £, or one-eighth of their earned income. Your readers should make their returns at once; the difference is worth saving.

THE INCOME-TAX ADJUSTMENT AGENCY (LIMITED),
9-11, Poultry, London, E.C. E. MONTAGUE, Secretary.

Liability for Attesting Transfer of Stock.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—I do not know of any authority on the liability, if any, which attaches to a mere witness of a transfer of stock or shares. I enclose you the regulations for the transfer of Consols, War Stock, &c., and you will observe that these require that execution by each party is to be attested by a "credible" witness. The difficulty lies in the word "credible." If it mean a witness to whose attestation credence should be given, then can the Bank, on the credence it attaches to the attestation, say, if the transferor who purports to be the holder of the stock transferred be not the holder he is repre-

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED A.D. 1720.

| | |
|---|---|
| FIRE, LIFE, SEA, PLATE GLASS, ACCIDENT, BURGLARY, LIVE STOCK, EMPLOYERS LIABILITY, THIRD PARTY, MOTOR CAR, LIFT, BOILER, FIDELITY GUARANTEES. | SPECIAL TERMS GRANTED TO ANNUITANTS WHEN HEALTH IS IMPAIRED. |
|---|---|

The Corporation is prepared to act as TRUSTEE and EXECUTOR.

Apply for full particulars of all classes of Insurance to the Secretary—

HEAD OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON, E.C.

LAW COURTS BRANCH: 29 & 30, HIGH HOLBORN, W.C.

mented to be, that the Bank has altered its position on the faith that the transfer was by a genuine holder, and can the Bank then claim against the "credible" witness for a false representation by reliance on which it had made a loss.

If I take a client to a broker, and on my introduction the broker identify the client as the holder of stock and permit a transfer, and it turn out that I have been imposed on by my client, the Bank can, if it have to replace the stock, sue the broker and the broker can sue me. If instead of taking a client to a broker, I merely, to oblige a casual acquaintance, attest his transfer, can I be held liable if the casual acquaintance be not the person he represent himself? Vaughan Williams, L.J., would apparently have held that I should not be liable, but I do not know that Farwell and Kennedy, L.J.J., would have agreed. At any rate I cannot find anything in *Bank of England v. Cutler* (1908, 2 K. B. 208) to settle the exact point, and it may be that a transfer attested by me as a credible witness may be part of a request, direction or demand—to use Lord Davey's words in *Sheffield v. Barclay* (1905, A. C., p. 399)—for which I may be liable.

The fact that I attest gratuitously seems immaterial, as consideration passes by the Bank when it acts on the transfer.

I should like your own and correspondents' views, and perhaps the Law Society may consider the point.

E. T. HARGRAVES.

10, Coleman-street, E.C., Sept. 13.

[Mr. Hargraves raises a point of great interest and importance which we should like to consider more fully before hazarding an opinion as to the liability or otherwise of the witness. Our recollection of *Cutler's case*, however, which we heard argued in the Court of Appeal seven years ago, is, that the Court intended to hold that a stockbroker's or banker's introduction of a transferor to the Bank of England, in order that he may obtain transfer of inscribed stock, is much more than a mere identification of the transferor as the person named in the books of the Bank; it is an actual request to it to make the transfer. Lord Justice Vaughan Williams, who dissented from his brethren's decision imposing liability on the stockbroker, argues throughout that there was a mere "identification" by the latter and therefore no request. On the other hand, his brethren in the majority lay stress on the combination of acts on the part of the broker—his making out of the ticket under instructions from his client, his taking of it to the Bank, and his receipt of the fee (see Lord Justice Farwell's remarks on page 232, and Lord Justice Kennedy's remarks on the fourth line from the top of page 236). As at present advised, therefore, we are rather impressed by the weight of the argument against Mr. Hargraves' suggestion.—ED. S.J.]

Mr. Tennant, in the House of Commons on Tuesday, replying to Mr. King, said: No organised effort has been made to employ interned aliens as distinct from true prisoners of war. Aliens cannot be forced to work. They are, however, in some cases employed locally, as in the erection of huts at Eastcote and the Isle of Man, but there is little money available for expenditure by local authorities on road construction and such work. Aliens are also employed in some cases on hay-making, tailoring, shoemaking, clerical work, and on repair work, under the direction of the Royal Engineers at places of internment. For this work they receive payment. It has been suggested, I believe, that there is some prohibition by the German Government against interned aliens undertaking work, but I know no foundation for such suggestion. Subject to the limitations I have indicated, there is every desire to make use of the time and labour of interned aliens in every possible way. The proposal to employ aliens upon the production of munitions of war would not, I apprehend, find general favour either in this House or the country, and in any case would be a question for my right hon. friend.

CASES OF LAST SITTINGS

House of Lords.

GREAT WESTERN AND METROPOLITAN RAILWAY COMPANIES v. HAMMERSMITH ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE. SAME v. KENSINGTON ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE. 21st, 22nd, 24th and 25th June; 28th July.

RATES—VALUATION—METROPOLIS—LINK LINE OF RAILWAY WORKED AT A LOSS—CONTRIBUTORY FEEDING VALUE—VALUATION (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1869 (32 & 33 VICT. c. 67), s. 32.

The appellants were joint owners of a short line of railway situated partly in the parish of Kensington and partly in the parish of Hammersmith. The appellants earned no profits on the line, but it had a contributive value as a feeder to the appellants' systems. The quarter sessions held they were not entitled to take into account the contributive value of the line, that neither company was a possible competitor for the sole occupation of the line, and that no other competitor would give a rent sufficient to support the assessment appealed against, and consequently the line must be assessed solely with regard to the earnings in the parish, which they assessed at £100. The Divisional Court reversed that decision, being of opinion that the line was rateable on the basis of its contributive value at £4,890, and on appeal that decision was affirmed.

Held, after consideration, that the decision of the Court of Quarter Sessions was right. There were no special circumstances of the line to take it out of the general rule laid down in the Banbury case (1909, A. C. 612), and the exceptional case of East London Railway Joint Committee v. Greenwich Union (1913, 1 K. B. 612) had no application. Decision of Court of Appeal (12 L. G. R. 1179) reversed.

Appeal by the Great Western and Metropolitan Railway Companies against an order of the Court of Appeal, reported affirming the judgment of a Divisional Court, on a case stated by quarter sessions. The question whether the quarter sessions was right as a matter of law in disregarding the contributory feeding value attached to the lines was argued on the cases of the *Great Central Railway Co. v. Banbury Union and Sheffield Union v. Great Central Railway Co.* (reported together, 1909, A. C. 78, 7 L. G. R. 227, 78 L. J. K. B. 225), and *East London Railway Joint Committee v. Greenwich Union Assessment Committee* (1913, 1 K. B. 612, 11 L. G. R. 205, 82 L. J. K. B. 297). The Courts below held that there were in the present case exceptional circumstances which entitled the quarter sessions to take into consideration the value of the line as a feeding line. The facts were shortly these:—The appellants are joint owners and occupiers of the Hammersmith and City Railway, about three miles in length, extending from Hammersmith Broadway to a junction with the Great Western Railway, close to Westbourne park Station. The line, it was stated, formed a feeder for the system of each railway company. The traffic on it had suffered severely from the competition of other lines and motor omnibuses, and it was found as a fact that the company made no profits earned upon it. It was contended, however, that the line had a contributory value as a feeder to the system of each of the companies, and that, if the Court of Quarter Sessions was entitled to take into consideration the feeding value attaching to the line, its rateable value in Hammersmith was £4,890, but if not so entitled, the rateable value was £100. The Court of Quarter Sessions held that it was not entitled to regard the element of contributory value as a feeder to the lines of either or both companies, and it assessed the rateable value at £100. That decision was reversed by a Divisional Court, whose judgment in favour of the assessment of £4,890 was affirmed by the Court of Appeal.

Lord BUCKMASTER, C., in giving judgment, said the railway in question possessed no characteristics that distinguished it from an ordinary suburban line, but the special circumstances under which it was conducted, and the special conditions under which it was now worked were relied upon by the respondents for the purpose of shewing that its annual value could only be properly ascertained by taking into consideration the increase of profits earned by the appellant company on other portions of their undertaking by means of the facilities which this piece of railway afforded. The respondents also urged that, if this contention were neglected, they were still entitled to have the rateable value fixed by considering a competitive rent determined by regarding each of the two companies as competitors. These points, and the general question of whether the method adopted by the Court of Quarter Sessions was the right one to adopt in the absence of special circumstances, were the points raised for decision in this House. There being nothing in the facts to require any special method of valuation, the case was reduced to the simple problem whether, on the one hand, the annual value built up by considering the actual profits earned, or, on the other, the value due to the fact that the line helped to increase the profits on other parts of the appellants' systems, ought to be taken as a standard for measuring the rent. So regarded, he thought the reasoning adopted in this House in *Great Central Railway Co. v. Banbury Union* (*supra*) shewed that the former of the two methods was correct. That case had been accepted as laying down a clear general rule to which there might be exceptions due to a variety of special circumstances, and with that view he was in entire agreement; but having carefully examined the facts, he could not find that any such special

circumstances existed in this case. The judgments of the Courts below would be reversed with costs, and the assessment of the Court of Quarter Sessions restored.

Earl LOREBURN, Lords ATKINSON, PARKER, and PARMOOR gave judgments to the like effect. Order accordingly.—COUNSEL, for the appellants, *Balfour Browne, K.C., and Konatam*; for the respondents the Hammersmith Assessment Committee, *Ernest Page, K.C., and H. Courthope Munroe, K.C.*; for the Kensington Assessment Committee, *H. Courthope Munroe, K.C., and S. G. Turner*. SOLICITORS, *L. B. Page; Watson, Sons, & Room; Pontifex, Pitt, & Johnson.*

[Reported by HASKINS REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

WOOTEN v. LICHFIELD BREWERY CO. Astbury, J. 28th July.

LICENSED PREMISES—COVENANT TO INSURE LICENCE AGAINST "LOSS OR FORFEITURE"—LICENCE REFUSED ON THE GROUND OF REDUNDANCY—RISK NOT INSURED AGAINST—LEASE SUBSEQUENT TO LICENSING ACT, 1904 (4 ED. 7, c. 23).

A covenant to insure a licence against loss or forfeiture is a covenant of indemnity, and not an absolute covenant.

Where under the Licensing Act, 1904, the lessor and lessee contribute to the compensation fund in the knowledge that statutory compensation for the loss of the licence by reason of redundancy is in operation under the provisions of the Act, the scope of such a covenant in the lease must be limited to insurance against loss or forfeiture through any act or omission on the part of the lessee, and it does not extend to cover loss of the licence by reason of redundancy under the Act. A decision to the contrary would in effect entitle the lessor to a double insurance.

Williams v. Lassell & Sharman (22 T. L. Rep. 443) not applicable.

This was an action in which the plaintiff claimed a declaration that the defendants, who were lessees, had committed a breach of the covenant in the lease, granted to them by the plaintiff in 1909, to insure the licence of the premises for £650 against loss or forfeiture, and damages for such breach. The defendants did insure the licence against loss or forfeiture by misconduct on the part of themselves as lessees, but did not include in such insurance the risk of non-renewal for redundancy. In 1914 the renewal of the licence was refused on the ground of redundancy, under the provisions of the Licensing Act, 1904, and by consent of both the lessors and lessees the compensation payable under the Act was assessed at £260. Under the provisions for compensation contained in the Act, both the lessor and the lessees contributed to the compensation fund, and the question in this action was whether non-renewal on the ground of redundancy was one of the risks covenanted to be insured against. The plaintiff contended that the case was covered by the decision in *Williams v. Lassell & Sharman* (*supra*), while the defendants contended that that case did not govern the matter, being a decision before the Licensing Act, 1904, which Act provided that both the lessor and the lessee should contribute to the compensation fund, and there was a refusal to renew on the ground of redundancy.

ASTBURY, J., after stating the facts, said: In my judgment the plaintiff fails in his action. The lessor and lessees have contributed to the compensation fund, knowing that statutory compensation for the loss of the licence by reason of redundancy is in operation. It could not have been intended that the lessor should be entitled to a double insurance. The covenant in the lease to insure must be limited to insurance against any loss or forfeiture through any act or omission on the part of the lessees. I think the decision in *Williams v. Lassell & Sharman* (*supra*) is distinguishable, as at that time the provisions for statutory compensation under the Licensing Act, 1904, had not come into force. I further hold that the covenant is a covenant of indemnity, and not an absolute covenant.—COUNSEL, the Hon. Frank Russell, K.C., and C. E. Bovill; N. Micklem, K.C., and J. E. Harman. SOLICITORS, *Gibson & Weldon*, for Francis G. Robinson, of Ilkeston; Sharp, Pritchard, & Co., for H. Russell & Sons, Lichfield.

[Reported by L. M. MAY, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Orders, &c.

War Orders and Proclamations, &c.

The *London Gazette* of 14th September contains the following:—

1. A Proclamation, dated 14th September (printed below), further defining the expression "enemy" in the Trading with the Enemy Proclamations.
2. An Order in Council, dated 14th September, applying the Defence of the Realm (Liquor Control) Regulations to the following areas:—

SCHEDULE.

Scotland, Northern Area, being the area comprised in the Counties of the Cities of Dundee and Aberdeen, the Counties of Perth, Forfar, Kincardine, Aberdeen, Banff, Elgin, and Nairn, including all Burghs within the geographical limits thereof; the Burgh of Inverness, so much of the Parish of Kilmorack as is situate to the North-East and East of the Highland Railway line from Dingwall to Inverness, and the Parishes of Kirkhill, Inverness, Petty, Ardersier, and Croy, in the County of Inverness, and such part of the County of Inverness, including all Burghs within the geo-

graphical limits thereof, as lies to the Eastward of Loch Linnhe and of a line drawn parallel to and two miles to the Westward of the western bank of the Caledonian Canal and the western shores of Lochs Lochy, Oich and Ness; the Burghs of Tain, Cromarty, Invergordon, Fortrose, and Dingwall, the Tain Licensing District, and the Parishes of Alness, Kiltarn, Dingwall, Fodderty, Orray, Urquhart, Resolis, Cromarty, Rosemarkie, Avoch, Knockbain, Killearnan, and Contin, in the County of Ross and Cromarty.

3. An Order in Council, dated 14th September, extending the Aliens Restriction (Isle of Man) Order, 1915, so as to provide for the registration of Belgian refugees in the Isle of Man.

A Proclamation

RELATING TO TRADING WITH THE ENEMY.

Whereas doubts have arisen as respects the position, under the Proclamations for the time being in force relating to Trading with the Enemy, of incorporated companies or bodies of persons which, though not incorporated in any enemy country or in territory in hostile occupation, carry on business in any such country or territory:

And whereas it is expedient that the position of those companies or bodies for the purposes of those Proclamations should be defined:

Now, therefore, We have thought fit, by and with the advice of Our Privy Council, to issue this Our Royal Proclamation declaring, and it is hereby declared, as follows:—

For the purposes of the Proclamations for the time being in force relating to Trading with the Enemy, the expression "enemy," notwithstanding anything in the said Proclamations, is hereby declared to include, and to have included, any incorporated company or body of persons (wherever incorporated) carrying on business in an enemy country or in any territory for the time being in hostile occupation.

14th September.

Seizure of I.L.P. Papers.

At the Mansion House on Monday, says the *Times*, before Alderman Sir John Knill, the owners of certain publications recently seized on the premises jointly occupied by the National Labour Press, Ltd., and the Independent Labour Party, at St. Bride's House, Salisbury-square, were summoned by the Director of Public Prosecutions to show cause why the documents should not be destroyed or otherwise disposed of. The Alderman, in spite of an appeal on behalf of the Independent Labour Party, decided to hear the case *in camera*, and after an hour's discussion in private it was announced that the further hearing of the summons had been adjourned to 22nd September.

Mr. Clarence Henry Norman was cited as the owner of two of the publications of which, in all, there were nineteen. The papers were seized by the City Police on 18th August, under a warrant issued under the Defence of the Realm Regulations, and it was alleged that they contained reports or statements the publication whereof would be an offence against Regulation 37.

Mr. Muir appeared for the Crown, and applied that the case might be heard *in camera*.

Mr. Holford Knight said he represented the Independent Labour Party, on whose premises the whole of these documents were seized, and he resisted the application.

Sir John Knill said any discussion of the application would defeat the object of the regulations. He had perused all the documents, and did not intend to look at them again unless his attention was specifically called to them during the course of the proceedings. He had decided to have the case taken *in camera*.

Defence of the Realm Cases in Camera.

In the House of Lords on Tuesday, says the *Times*, Lord Parmoor asked the Lord President of the Council on whose authority it was determined whether an application should be made for the hearing of a criminal charge under the Defence of the Realm Acts *in camera*. He said our legal liberties depended upon criminal proceedings being heard in public; and while no one would object to any such case being heard *in camera*, in the interest of national safety, he was not disposed to trust the Department of Public Prosecutions with the decision. Until one knew with whom the responsibility rested and who it was who actually gave the direction under which the prosecuting counsel acted, he did not feel sure that a wide power of this kind might not be used in a way which he would consider hardly fair.

The Lord Chancellor said an acute and learned lawyer like the noble lord could have found the answer to his own question by looking up the Act, which made it plain that where a trial took place *in camera* it was on the application of the prosecution, and that application must take place at the trial. It was perfectly impossible to say in any particular prosecution that any one particular person was responsible for the application being made. Having recalled the conditions under which trials *in camera* take place, the Lord Chancellor submitted that the question who instigated the application to the Court was a matter of no moment. It was the Court which had to decide, and not the prosecution, whether the public should or should not be shut out.

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,
18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—John Croft Deverell, Esq. Deputy Chairman—Richard Stephens Taylor, Esq.

James Austen-Cartmel, Esq.
Alexander Dingwall Bateson, Esq., K.C.
John George Butcher, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Felix Cassel, Esq., K.C., M.P.
Edmund Church, Esq.
Philip G. Collins, Esq.
Harry Mitton Crookenden, Esq.
Robert William Diddis, Esq.
Sir Kenelm K. Digby, G.C.B., K.C.
Charles Baker Dimond, Esq.

Richard L. Harrison, Esq.
L. W. North Hickley, Esq.
Archibald Herbert James, Esq.
William Maples, Esq.
Allan Ernest Messer, Esq.
The Right Hon. Lord Justice Phillimore
Charles R. Kivington, Esq.
Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.
The Hon. Charles Russell
Charles Wigan, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED - - £5,000,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Reversions and Life Interests Purchased. Loans on Approved securities entertained on Favourable Terms.

W. P. PHELPS, Actuary and Secretary.

After having once more carefully considered the Statutes, his only surprise was at their moderation. He was astonished that, when we stood in the peril and jeopardy in which we found ourselves to-day, when we not only had to fight the enemy in the open field, but to fight their spies which were in every land trying to enmesh and entangle every Government, we had found it possible to proceed under the comparatively mild and benevolent legislation which had been established by the Statute.

Lord Parmoor said the questions of policy raised by the Lord Chancellor had not been raised by him. If the noble and learned lord's view was that the present legislation was not adequate, he assumed that the Government would take the responsibility of introducing other legislation. For his part, if any legislation of that kind were introduced he should do his best to oppose it at every possible stage, because he believed that they only promoted some evils by too drastic legislation. The Lord Chancellor had not given any satisfactory answer to the question. What he asked was, Who took the responsibility? He presumed the prosecuting counsel acted on instructions. Who gave those instructions? To that he had received no answer.

Lord Courtney expressed concern in regard to the spirit of the Lord Chancellor's reply. He urged that some judicial tribunal ought to decide that it was necessary that a case should be heard *in camera* before publicity, which was the greatest safeguard of justice, was avoided.

Lord St. Davids said he believed that the Lord Chancellor had expressed the view of every noble lord in the House with the exceptions of Lord Parmoor and Lord Courtney. The talk of safeguarding publicity was out of date and irrelevant at a time when everybody was thinking of safeguarding the country.

German Peace Proposals.

In the House of Commons on Wednesday, says the *Times*, Mr. D. M. Mason asked for an interpretation of passages in the reply made by Sir E. Grey to speeches by the German Minister of Finance recently in the Reichstag.

Lord B. Cecil, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, who replied, said: It is impossible for me to deal at length with the interpretation of certain passages in Sir Edward Grey's communication to the Press without running very grave risk of doing injury to the public interest. It is clear that the German Finance Minister's reference to an indemnity related to the imposition of an indemnity on this country. I suppose the object of the German Finance Minister was to encourage his own friends, without his having the slightest hope of being able to bring his prophecies and suggestions to fruition. It is quite unnecessary to say that no such suggestion could be for a moment entertained by the Government of this country. I think it is also as clear as it can be from the communication of my right hon. friend the Foreign Secretary that we are not going to consider for a moment any question of the limitation of our power on the sea except conceivably or imaginably as part of the general question of the pacification of Europe. There certainly is no intention or suggestion whatever that we are to deprive ourselves of any legitimate weapon against Germany. What my right hon. friend said was merely a general observation that, if there was a general pacification we might have to reconsider the whole question of the methods of making war on land and sea. My hon. friend also asks me whether any peace proposals have been made by Germany to America. It is quite obvious that it is impossible for me to reply as to what communications may have taken place between Germany and America as to peace unless they had been communicated to us by the American Government, which, I need not say, is not so. As to any peace proposals made to us by Germany, as is well known, no such proposals have been made. I cannot imagine at present that there is any probability that they will make any proposals which could be even entertained for a moment by the Allies who are fighting against them. I wish to make it quite clear, so as to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding in any part of this country or in foreign countries, that no consideration will be given to any suggestion of peace except in common with our Allies and in conformity with our treaty obligations to them.

The Government Land Valuation.

Mr. C. H. Kenderdine, the Secretary of the Land Union, has sent the following letter to the Press:—

As divers statements, varying in many essential particulars as to the completion of the valuation, have recently appeared in the Press, may I be allowed to state briefly what I understand to be the actual facts.

In towns and suburbs a large percentage of the provisional valuations have been made and served, but it does not follow that these valuations have been finally settled. As a fact, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on 17th August, 1914, notified the Land Union that in the case of all provisional valuations served within sixty days prior to mobilisation or served after that date the period within which objections may be lodged is extended indefinitely until further notice.

Apart from this, thousands of valuations served prior to, and unaffected by, this concession are under objection and likely to remain so pending final decisions of the Courts on questions of law.

With regard to agricultural land (the greater area of the country), the valuation in the present state of the law must remain at a standstill until fresh legislation is introduced.

In these circumstances the release of the bulk of the temporary staff of the Valuation Department for enlistment or national work is a natural corollary, and one to which the Land Union attaches no political significance.

Obituary.

Sir Arthur Collins.

The death occurred last Sunday at his residence in Kensington of Sir Arthur John Hammond Collins, an ex-Chief Justice of Madras.

Sir Arthur Collins was born in 1834, and was a son of Mr. John Collins, of Heatherland, Parkstone, Dorset. He was called to the Bar at Gray's Inn (he was also a barrister of the Middle Temple) in 1860, took silk in 1877, and was elected in the same year a bencher of Gray's Inn, of which society he was twice treasurer—in 1883 and in 1905. On the second occasion he filled the gap caused by the death of Mr. H. C. Richards, K.C., M.P., who died almost immediately after his acceptance of the office. In 1873 Collins was appointed Recorder of Poole, and six years later Recorder of Exeter, holding the last-named office till 1885, when he was appointed Chief Justice of the High Court of Madras, receiving a knighthood at the same time. He presided over that Court for nearly fifteen years, and during the last ten years of his stay in India he held the office of Vice-Chancellor of the University of Madras. Before going to India Sir Arthur Collins was one of the leaders of the Western Circuit. He had a very fine presence, and he gained considerable reputation as a cross-examiner, his powers as such having been made the subject of a tribute by the late Montagu Williams in his "Leaves from a Life." He was chosen as a member of the Council of Legal Education in 1904.

Sir Arthur Collins married in 1863 the only daughter of the late Rev. Richard Wilson, D.D., of Chelsea, sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

Mr. Ronald F. B. Dickinson.

Captain Ronald F. B. Dickinson, Liverpool Scottish, who was wounded and captured by the Germans at Hooge on 16th June last, died soon after his capture, and was buried to the north of Bellewaarde. When taken prisoner he was wounded in five places. The second son of Mr. and Mrs. George Dickinson, of Red How, Cumberland, and Sunny-side, Liverpool, he was educated at Rugby, and was admitted a solicitor in 1910. When his battalion was mobilized at the outbreak of war he was a manager of his father's late firm, Messrs. Hill, Dickinson & Co., of Liverpool. He joined the Liverpool Scottish in 1906, obtaining his company in 1912. He went to the front with his battalion in October last, and his name was among those mentioned in Sir John French's June dispatches.

Mr. Edward H. S. Bligh.

Lieutenant Edward Henry Swinburne Bligh, who was killed at the Dardanelles on 10th September, was the only son of the late Rev. the Hon. Henry Bligh and of the Hon. Mrs. Bligh, of Prior's Barton, Winchester. He was born in April, 1884, and was called to the Bar in July, 1908. A memorial service will be held at Winchester Cathedral on 20th September at 2.45.

Mr. Arthur Russell.

We regret to record that Mr. Arthur Russell, the senior partner in the firm of Russell & Sons, of 59, Coleman-street, E.C., died on 26th August, aged seventy, of heart failure, following upon a few days' illness.

IT'S WAR-TIME, BUT—DON'T FORGET
THE MIDDLESEX HOSPITAL.
ITS RESPONSIBILITIES ARE GREAT AND MUST BE MET.

Mr. Russell will probably be best remembered for his long connection with the British Land Company, Limited, and the National Freehold Land and Building Society, with which bodies he and his father, Mr. Robert Russell, were connected since their original formation. It may be remembered that these bodies received their inception from the late John Bright and Richard Cobden, for the purpose of increasing the roll of 40s. voters by enabling the working man to acquire his own residence, and much of the success which has been attained by these companies is, no doubt, the result of their being advised by a sound and capable lawyer.

Mr. Russell was more particularly known to the profession as a conveyancer of the old school, his careful and exact habits and indefatigable attention to detail being in striking contrast to the methods of the up-to-date conveyancer. Such weight, indeed, was attached to his reputation as a conveyancer that it has become the practice of the profession to accept a conveyance from the British Land Company as a perfect root of title, full confidence being felt that any title from them, and passed by Mr. Russell, must be perfectly good.

In his personal life he was quiet and retiring, of an amiable disposition, and greatly liked; above all things honourable and straightforward in all his dealings.

Legal News.

Changes in Partnerships.

Admission.

Mr. HERBERT CECIL WHITTUCK has become a member of the firm of Ernest Bevir & Son, of Devereux-chambers, Temple, London, W.C. The practice will continue to be carried on under the present style of Ernest Bevir & Son.

Dissolutions.

REGINALD STORER CHAMBERLAIN, EDWARD WILLIAM JOHNSON, RICHARD VINCENT JOHNSON, and HYAM LEVY, solicitors (Chamberlain, Johnson, & Levy), 30, Essex-street, Strand, London. July 1. So far as concerns the said Reginald Storer Chamberlain, who has retired from the said firm. The said Edward William Johnson, Richard Vincent Johnson, and Hyam Levy will continue to carry on the said business under the said style or firm.

ROBERT SUTCLIFFE and WILLIAM TRENHOLME, solicitors (Sutcliffe & Trenholme), 3, Booth-street, Bradford. August 28.

WARWICK WEBB and CECIL DUNSTAN WEBB, solicitors and Parliamentary agents (Warwick Webb, Son, & Co.), 37 and 39, Essex-street, Strand, London. June 30. As from that date the said Warwick Webb will continue to carry on the business under the above style or firm.

[Gazette, Sept. 10.]

Information Required.

Re JAMES GORDON MCKINLEY, Deceased.—Any solicitor or other person having prepared or having any knowledge or the custody of any will of Lieutenant James Gordon McKinley, formerly of "Iburi," Brighton, Victoria, Australia, and lately residing at 19, Bury-street, St. James's, S.W., who died of wounds received in Flanders in June last, is requested to communicate with Messrs. Langlois, Harding, Warren, & Tate, solicitors, 170, Bishopsgate, E.C.

General.

In the House of Commons, on Wednesday, Sir J. Simon, replying to Mr. King, said: From 14th May to 10th September, inclusive, 4,460 female alien enemies over the age of eighteen and 2,924 children under the age of eighteen have left the United Kingdom. Separate statistics as to the sex of the children have not been kept. Up to 13th September 3,176 female alien enemies have been officially notified that their applications for exemption from repatriation have been granted. In a large number of other cases the Advisory Committee has recommended exemption, and these are being dealt with as quickly as possible. No women have been interned as prisoners of war. Arrangements have been made by which, on application being made, property in this country belonging to an alien enemy who is returning to her own country can be placed in the custody of the Public Trustee.

In the Patents Court on Wednesday, says the *Times*, an application was made by Mr. Charles H. Gameson (Gameson & Sons, Ltd., Walsall) for an order of avoidance or suspension in the case of a patent granted in 1908 regarding a machine for the "tinning" of iron articles with soft metals. The patentees were Messrs. Samson Brothers, of Hamburg. The British firm said the machine supplied had not come up to their expectations, and they considered the rent and royalties for their use too high. The Comptroller said the case raised a new question, which had not been decided before. In this case there was an existing contract, the German part of which had been fulfilled. The applicant, believing he had made a contract which had not proved remunerative, was applying for its suspension. In numerous cases the Court had disregarded licences to Germans, and had treated them as non-existent, but they could not annul the contract existing in this case. The appli-

cant said his firm did not wish the contract terminated if the royalties could be reduced. The Comptroller said he would report to the Board of Trade.

The Central Control Board (Liquor Traffic), says the *Times*, is holding local inquiries during the course of the next two weeks at Chatham, Portsmouth, Plymouth, Devonport, Pembroke, and Sheerness as to the desirability of extending the action of the drink restriction orders to these dockyard areas. Inquiries with the same object will also be held late in September at Birmingham, Leeds, and Sheffield.

A private in the 10th County of London Regiment, charged as a deserter at the North London Police Court last week, denied that he was the man wanted, and said he had a twin brother very much like him who had joined the Army. The Magistrate: How old is your brother? The Prisoner: Thirty-nine. The Magistrate: You gave your age as thirty-four? The prisoner then admitted the offence and was detained for an escort.

Among the jury men who were summoned to attend an inquest last week at Holloway Prison was a middle-aged man in khaki, who, in reply to a question by the Coroner, said he had only just come home from the front on seven days' leave. The Coroner remarked that he was sorry a man who had been fighting for his country and had been given a respite for a few days should have been called upon. The soldier replied that it did not matter; he did not wish to be excused, but would stay and see the matter through.

In the House of Lords, on Tuesday, Earl St. Aldwyn drew attention to the Order in Council postponing the Disestablishment of the Church in Wales until the end of the war, and pointed out that this phrase, which had been used in regard to a number of Acts, was very indefinite. He asked the Leader of the House whether some statutory interpretation could not be given to it. The Marquess of Crewe said that he would consult with his colleagues and see what steps could be taken with a view to arriving at some final definition of this somewhat obscure phrase which appeared in various Acts of Parliament, and of which, as far as he knew, no authorized interpretation had yet been given either in that House or the other.

In the House of Commons, on Wednesday, Sir J. Simon, replying to Mr. King, said: The property of interned persons remains theirs, subject to the provisions of the Aliens Restriction Order in regard to prohibited articles, such as motors, cameras, etc. The purchase of clothes, books, and other things from outside is allowed, subject to censorship and supervision. Money is required to be deposited with the commandant or in a camp bank, and may be drawn upon as needed; cheques may be drawn for reasonable purposes, but cheque-books must be in the custody of the camp authorities. Judging from the information available, British policy in these matters is more lenient than that in force in Germany or Austria-Hungary.

Writing to the *Times* on the 16th inst., "A Country Rector" says: Sir,—This morning I received a registered letter from a local "valuer appointed by the Commissioners of Inland Revenue," in which I am solemnly told that my churchyard bears an assessable site value of £100. If the land or any interest in the land has been sold or mortgaged at any time within twenty years before 30th April, 1909, then the site value may be varied, &c. (fancy any rector mortgaging or selling the parish churchyard?) This is the kind of child's play on which the Commissioners of Inland Revenue are employing the time of State officials in the year 1915, when the country is waging a terrible war wherein its very national existence is imperilled. Enough of this tomfoolery. Surely it is time for Parliament to put a stop to it. Let these useless officials transfer their valuable services to the trenches or the munition factories. Two of them here, the other day, were watched and stalked by the police while engaged in taking observations with maps, note-books, &c. They were in risk of arrest as suspected spies!

An appeal involving a claim to a Crown prerogative has, says the *Times*, been decided at Edinburgh by Lord Anderson. The case arose out of an Admiralty contract at Rosyth. Before the contract was completed the contractor's estates were sequestered, and his trustee declined to carry on the contract. The Admiralty employed another contractor to finish the contract at an extra cost of £1,049, and for that sum they claimed a preferential ranking on the contractor's sequestered estates. The trustee admitted the claim to an ordinary ranking, but rejected it in so far as made for a preferential ranking. Lord Anderson refused the Admiralty's appeal, and sustained the trustee's deliverance. The appellants were found liable in costs. His Lordship said that it was part of the common law of England that the Crown possessed that prerogative which might be asserted in the distribution of a sequestered estate. That was also the law of Ireland. It was contended that the doctrine of Crown prerogative as applicable to all kinds of debts had been introduced into the law of Scotland by the Act of Queen Anne. His Lordship did not agree with that contention, but in any event he held that the Bankruptcy Act, 1913, impliedly abrogated any such alleged prerogative.

In the High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh, on Wednesday, says the *Times*, before the Lord Justice-General, the trial was concluded of Signalmen Meakin and Tinsley and Fireman Hutchinson on a charge of culpable homicide in connection with the Gretna railway collision on 22nd May. The driver of the express train and the driver of the pilot engine of the express having given evidence, the Lord Advocate intimated that he did not propose to press further the charge against Hutchinson, and the Lord Justice-General said he would direct the jury to find him not guilty. The Lord Advocate, addressing the jury, attributed the

THE BRITISH LAW FIRE

INSURANCE COMPANY, LIMITED,

5, LOTHBURY, LONDON, E.C.

(with Branches throughout the United Kingdom).

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL ... £1,050,000

PAID-UP CAPITAL ... £150,000

RESERVES ... £288,000

General Manager—DAVID M. LINLEY. Secretary—T. WILLIAMS.

FIRE, FIDELITY GUARANTEE, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY, PERSONAL ACCIDENT AND SICKNESS, BURGLARY, THIRD PARTY, MOTOR-CAR, LIFT, CRANE AND HOIST, BOILER AND ENGINE, PROPERTY OWNERS' INDEMNITY, LOSS OF PROFITS due to FIRE, GLASS BREAKAGE, LIVE STOCK.

Gentlemen in a position to introduce Business are invited to undertake Agencies within the United Kingdom. No Foreign Business undertaken.

accident to the clandestine arrangement between Meakin and Tinsley, and held it to be intolerable that the lives of the travelling public should be imperilled and even sacrificed in order that a signalman might spend half an hour more between the sheets on a particular morning. The Lord Justice-General, in summing up, said the staggering fact in the case was that Tinsley had just left the local train as it was passing from the down to the up main line when he entered the signal-box, and it would be difficult to explain that fact consistently with the men having faithfully discharged their duty. Meakin admitted that he did not put on the lever collar. It was imperative that that should have been done by Meakin, who began the shunting operation, and not left to any incoming signalmen. His Lordship supposed nothing would have happened if the two men had not agreed to deceive their superior officer, for Meakin would have taken all the precautions of the signalman on duty. The jury, after five minutes' absence, unanimously found Hutchinson not guilty and Meakin and Tinsley guilty. The Lord Justice-General said he saw room for drawing a distinction, and he would pass sentence of eighteen months' imprisonment on Meakin and three years' penal servitude on Tinsley.

The public are cautioned to be sure of obtaining the genuine "Oxford" Sectional Bookcase, as exhibited at "Ideal Homes" and other exhibitions, particulars of which may be obtained free from the sole inventors and manufacturers, William Baker & Co., Oxford. Avoid imitations, which, although similar in name and general appearance, are quite differently constructed, of inferior finish, and more expensive. The "Oxford" is only genuine when connected with the name of WILLIAM BAKER & Co.—(Advt.)

Winding-up Notices.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 10.

ALLEN JESSOP & SONS, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to George William Smith, 23, John William at Huddersfield, liquidator.

CYSTA MANUFACTURING CO., LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their claims, to Herbert J. Daydon, 1, Cathedral gates, Manchester, liquidator.

HOLLOWAYS PRESERVES, LTD. (HEREFORD).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 28 to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Yeadon, 78, Green at, Hereford, liquidator.

PNEUMELASTICUM, LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Thomas Daniel Charles Brown, liquidator, c/o Warren & Warren, 4, Gr. at James st.

SPIRAL REGULATING DYNAMO CO., LTD. (IN LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 30, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Henry Charles Bound, 61 and 62, Lincoln's Inn fields, liquidator.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 14.

GATHERCOLE BROS. LTD.—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts and claims, to William Prett, Bank bldgs, 1, High at, Croydon, or to Frederic William Davis, 95 and 97, Finsbury pvt., liquidators.

NOROL-DYNAMITE TRUST CO., LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Sept. 28, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Harold John Mitchell and Matthew Bain Dickie, 220, Winchester house, Old Broad at, liquidators.

UNDERCLIFFE PAVILION, LTD. (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION).—Creditors are required, on or before Oct. 7, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Arnold Hooper, 5, Old Bank chmbrs, Bradford, liquidator.

Resolutions for Winding-up Voluntarily.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 10.

Mallard Motor Co, Ltd.
Albion Steel Co, Ltd.
Bosquet & Wheeler, Ltd.
Briton Steamship Co, Ltd.
H. E. C. Robinson & Co, Ltd.
Lincoln Advertising and Bill Posting Co, Ltd.
British Decorative Glass Co, Ltd.

Petroliferous Lands, Ltd.
John Topp, Ltd.
Castletown Town Hall Co, Ltd.
Old Fort Chemical Co, Ltd.
Rajhat and Farrowah Estates, Ltd.
Lawton, Son & Co, Ltd.
Townsend Motor and Carriage Works, Ltd.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 14.

Cambrian Mercantile Syndicate, Ltd.
Charles Hill & Co, Ltd.
Nobel-Dynamite Trust Co, Ltd.

Vore Shipping Co, Ltd.
Brazilian Goldfields, Ltd.

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 3.

BATES, GEORGE DUDLEY, Worthing Oct 1 Green, Worthing
BRADLEY, ADAM FRANCIS, Falmouth Oct 2 Rogers & Son, Falmouth
BRADLEY, THOMAS EDWARD, West Hartlepool Sept 30 Smith, West Hartlepool
CANDY, WILLIAM, Winchester Oct 11 Bailey & Co, Winchester
CHRISTIE, JAMES HUGH, Fermoyle, Cork, Ireland Oct 15 Roy & Cartwright, Coleman at
COLSON, LUCY, Sheriff rd, West Hampstead Sept 30 EY & H Landon, New Broad st
COOPER, WILLIAM HENRY, St James's pl, Piccadilly Oct 14 Janion & Hall, Manchester
CRAWFORD, HANNAH, Gateshead Sept 30 Ord, Gateshead
CROSS, DAVID WILLIAM, Lower Kennington ln, Lambeth, Publican Oct 16 Gowing
Brixton hill
CURTIS, JAMES WILLIAM, Ilford, Essex, Blouse Manufacturer Oct 4 Carr & C
Kood ln
DEAN, JOHN, Gorton, Manchester Oct 9 Hardicker & Hanson, Manchester
DENNY, HANNAH, Wakefield Oct 6 Wm and T O Dickinson, Wakefield
DE VINS PRYOR, MARGARET FRANCES, Gunterstone rd, West Kensington Oct 4 Vessey
Baldock, Herts
DRINKWATER, GEORGE, Heaton Moss, Lancs Oct 1 Johnsons, Stockport
DUNDERDALE, JANE, Galgate, Lancs Sept 25 Maxsted & Co, Lancaster
EVANS, HUGH ARTHUR, Woodwich Oct 5 Trellope & Winckworth, Dartmouth st,
Westminster
GARNER, ANNE, Birklade, Southport Oct 15 Beech, Manchester
GOLDSTEIN, PHILIP, Dewhurst rd, Shepherd's Bush Oct 2 Fielder & Co, Raymond bldgs
Gray's Inn
HIGGS, DAVID, Hounslow, Middx, Market Gardener Sept 30 Garner & Sons, Hounslow
HORNPOOL, MARY MARIA, Rotherham, Yorks Oct 16 Bradford, Rotherham
HOWE, FRANCES MARGUERITA, Sherwood, Notts Oct 1 Burton & Briggs, Nottingham
INCH, MARGARET HARRIET, North Shields Sept 30 R & E F Kidd, North Shields
LYALL, HARRY WILLIAM, Savile row, Solicitor Sept 30 Lyall & Barlas, Savile row
Burlington gdns
LYES, GEORGE, Wisbech Saint Peter, Cambridge, Foreman Corporation Pavior Oct 4
Southwell & Dennis, Wisbech
MANOIN, WILLIAM NANGREAVE, Preston, Chatham, Northumberland Oct 12 Dickson
& Co, Aldwick
MARTON, ADELAIDE ESTHER, Carnforth, Lancs Sept 25 Maxsted & Co, Lancaster
MASON, SARAH, Willenhall, Staffs Oct 4 Thursfield & Co, Wednesbury
MILLAR, HENRY, Haverfordwest, Butcher Sept 30 Eaton-Evans & Williams, Haver
fordwest
NEWTON, FREDERICK, Leeds, Dairyman Oct 23 Walter & E. H. Foster, Leeds
PALMER, RONALD WILLIAM, Reading Sept 29 Waterhouse & Co, New et, Lincoln's
Inn
PARK, JESSIE, Harrogate Oct 4 Powell & Co, Harrogate
PUDDENPHATT, WILLIAM, Luton, Beds Sept 23 Hodgkinson, Birmingham
RIDEWOOD, WILLIAM SAUNDERS, Eitham, Kent Oct 1 Scard, Blackheath rd, Green-
wich
RIDGE, BETSEY, Kaling Common Oct 15 Roy & Cartwright, Coleman at
RIVERS, ANN MARGARET, Blackheath Oct 9 Rivers & Milne, Gracechurch st
SANDENMAN, JANE ELIZABETH, Tunbridge Wells Oct 10 Lickfold & Sons, Coleman at
SAUNDERS, ELIZABETH, Cavesham, Reading Oct 1 Collins, Reading
SCHOLES, ELLEN, Goostray, Chester Oct 15 Smith & Co, Stockport
SHEAR, THOMAS, Byfield, Northampton Oct 14 Fairfax & Barfield, Banbury
SHEPHERD, RICHARD, Hornby, Lancs, Farmer Sept 25 Maxsted & Co, Lancaster
SIMPSON, JOHN, Lancaster Sept 25 Maxsted & Co, Lancaster
SLACKER, ROGER CECIL, Hurlingham, Middx Oct 1 Harris, Cardiff
GOUTH, WILLIAM, Brighton, Builder Sept 29 Cane, Brighton
SPARGO, JOHN, Stoke upon Trent, Bakery Engineer Oct 1 Marshall & Co, Stoke upon
Trent
STANLEY, SUSAN, Binfield rd, Clapham rd Oct 10 Draper, Ebury st, Westminster
STARWAY, MARY THORNE, Whalley Range, Manchester Oct 15 Chatham & Co, Man-
chester
STOLLERY, JOHN CECIL, Hove, Sussex Oct 14 Wansey & Co, Moorgate at
STUART, Rev Sir JAMES, Burghfield, Berks Oct 1 Collins, Reading
SUTTON, ELLEN, Reading Oct 15 Brain & Brain, Reading
TERRIER, CLAUDE, Woolston, near Southampton Oct 11 Lowless & Co, Great St
Helens
TODD, CATHERINE, Greenside, Ryton, Durham Sept 30 Ord, Gateshead
TWIGG, WILLIAM, Rotherham, Yorks Sept 30 Twigg, Rotherham
VAN, Rev HENRY JOHN FRANK, Symbridge, Devon Oct 6 Norman, Little College st
WALKER, COCHRANE, Leith, N Britain Oct 2 Morgan & Co, Old Broad st
WARD, JONATHAN, Harrogate Oct 1 Raworth & Co, Harrogate
WEBB, CHARLES LABAN, Hove, Sussex Oct 3 Hooper, Brighton
WILKINSON, JONATHAN, Cranbrook, Kent, Wool Buyer Sept 24 Buss & Lovett,
Tunbridge Wells

WILSON, JOHN, Toynston Saint Peters, nr Spilaby, Lincoln, Farmer Oct 6 Walker & Co
Spilaby
WRIGHT, HENRY GORDON, Sutton-in-Ashfield, Notts Oct 9 Gay, Nottingham

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 7.

ALT, GEORGE EARL, Cadogan st Oct 8 Radham & Co, 8.1ters' Hall ct
AVERY, EMILY SUBANNAH, Folkestone Oct 7 Howlett, Maidstone
BARNES, DOUGLAS MESTON, Hendon, Middx Oct 11 Churchill, Essex st, Strand
BEATTIE, ROBERT ALEXANDER, Bradford Oct 5 Moore & Shepherd, Bradford
RINGHAM DAVID CECIL, Tite st, Chelsea Oct 14 Gasquet & Co, Gt Tower st
BOTTOMLEY, JOHN, Stalybridge, Chester, Cotton Waste Dealer Oct 5, Simister, Staly
bridge
CASWELL, ANNE FRANK, Fortishead, Somerset Oct 15 Habgood, Bristol
CHOICE, HENRY, Willard, Devon, Builder Sept 30 Burrow, Cullington
COOPER, GEORGE, Sheffield Oct 11 Fry-Smith & Barker, Sheffield
CRUICKSHANK, JOHN, Itchen, Southampton Oct 25 Aldridge, Southampton
DALY, PETER, Higher Broughton, Manchester Oct 15 Bond & Son, Manchester
EAGERS, ROSINA, Bath Bridge, Bristol Oct 9 Sinnott & Son, Bristol
ELLIS, THOMAS, Rotherham, Cab Proprietor Oct 20 Bradford, Rotherham
EWBANK, FLORENCE KENNEDY, Halesworth, Suffolk Oct 30 Bowman & Hayward,
Arundel st
FERGUSON, EDITH, Folkestone Sept 29 Drewry & Newbold, Burton on Trent
GEORGE, EMMA ELIZABETH, Smethwick, Staffs Oct 9 Shirley & Co, Birmingham
GILFILLAN, JOHN ALFRED, Nasington rd, Hampstead Oct 19 Slaughter & May,
Austin friars
GOWER, EMMA, Brighton Oct 10 Sloper & Co, York House, High st, Wandsworth
GROOM, FRANCES, Harwich Oct 20 Ward & Co, Harwich
GROVES, LOUISE, Nottingham Oct 9 Goodall & Co, Nottingham
HAYES, JANE, Verran, Cornwall Oct 4 Hancock, Truro
HIGGS, DAVID, Hounslow, Market Gardener Sept 30 Garner & Sons, Hounslow
KENWARD, ELLEN, Croydon Oct 9 Dawes & Son, Rye, Sussex
LONG, ALEXANDER JOHN WAKEMAN, Meadi, nr Cairo, Egypt Oct 6 Westbury & Co
Old Broad st
MITCHELL, EMMA, Horsham, Sussex Oct 9 Marchant & Co, Bank bldg., Broadway,
Deptford
MURDOCH, EDWARD, Prenton, Birkenhead, Baker Sept 30 Lees, Birkenhead
PATTERSON, EDWARD TEMPLE, Culford gdns, Chelsea Nov 5 Rowe & Wilkie, W.oi
Exchange, Basinghall st
PENNYTHORNE, the Rev. GREGORY WALTON, Heathfield Vicarage, Sussex Oct 20 Sprott
& Sons, Mayfield, Sussex
PLATT, EDWARD, Hadfield, Derby, Cotton Manufacturer Oct 25 J & E Whitworth, Man-
chester
ROWLAND, WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Steynton, Pembroke, Farmer Sept 30 Eaton-Evans &
Williams, Haverfordwest
SMITH, WILLIAM, Framlingham, Suffolk Oct 11 Ling & Son, Framlingham
WARD, BASIL MIGNOT, Captain in 1st Essex Regt, killed at the Dardanelles Oct 10
Ward & Co, Harwich
WENDALL, JOHN, Wangford, Suffolk, Innkeeper Oct 1 Cooper, Southwold
WILLIAMS, WILLIAM FRITCHARD, Tulpay House, nr Hereford, Farmer Sept 21 Scobie,
Hereford
WINTER, WILLIAM, and MINNIE MAUD WINTER, Green ln, East Dulwich Oct 7 Rack-
ham Norwich
WORSLEY, JOHN, Rusholme, Manchester, Estate Agent Oct 25 J & E Whitworth Man-
chester

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 10.

ADAMS, THOMAS, Edgbaston, Birmingham Oct 11 Wallace & Co, Birmingham
ANDERSON, ANDY FELLOWES, Walpole st, Sloane sq Sept 30 Cross & Sons, Lancaster
pl, Strand
BARNES, JOHN, Streatham, Surrey Oct 19 Colyer & Colyer, Clement's Inn
BERNARD, JULIA, Lancaster gate, Hyde pk Oct 11 Montagu & Co, Bucklersbury
BELFORD, ALEXANDER AGNEW, Ashton on Mersey, Chester Oct 11 Rylands & Sons,
Manchester
BETTS, FRANCES HELEN, Buckfast, Devon Nov 10 Toner & Dell, Teignmouth
BETTY, ELIZA, Stratford, Berks Oct 27 Hughes & Manser, Coventry
BRAIN, JOHN, Steights, nr Whitby, Yorks, Builder Oct 16 Buchanan & Son,
Whitby
BROOKE, RICHARD REGINALD MAUD, Captain, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light
Infantry Oct 16 Martley & Barlow, Westland row, Dublin
BURTON, FANNY LOUISE, Coventry Oct 11 Orton, Coventry
CRANFILL, HELEN MACKENZIE, Upper Parkstone, Dorset Oct 8 Kekewich & Co
Suffolk
COPLAND, CHARLES WILLIE, Broadhurst gdns, South Hampstead, Professor of Singing
Oct 1 Ashford, Great Marlborough st
EGGLESTON, JOHN, Keyworth, Nottingham, Miller Oct 20 Williams & Co, Nottingham
FOX, ROBERT, Falmouth Oct 8 Kekewich & Co, Suffolk ln
HARVEY, CHARLOTTE, Reading Sept 29 Witherington, Reading
HARWOOD, ANN, Huddington, Notts Oct 11 Hobington & Co, Derby
HIMMERS, MARIA, Pendleton, Salford Oct 19 Hadfield & Co, Manchester
JONES, CHARLES, Churchtown, Southport, Pharmaceutical Chemist Nov 1 Clayton &
Sons, Ashton under Lyne
JOSEPH, RACHEL PAULINE, Ronda rd, Cricklewood, Middx Oct 19 Colyer & Colyer
Clement's Inn
MACDONALD, CHARLES EDWARD, Hamston house, Kensington Oct 31 Sladen & Wing
Queen Anne's gate
MCIVOR, SUSAN CLARISSA, Kullakamby, Nilgiris, India Oct 3 Letts Bros, Bartlett's
bldgs
NICHOLSON, CHARLES, Southport Oct 18 Shuttleworth & Dallas, Preston
PATTEN, FRISILLA, Cronton, Lancs Oct 11 Menzies & Co, Liverpool
PERKINS, EMMA JANE, Sandown, Isle of Wight Oct 7 Beckingsale, Sandown
PICKLES, JOHN, Halifax Oct 15 Land & Foster, Halifax
POWIS, CHARLES SAMUEL, Croxted rd, Dulwich Oct 16 Sandom & Co, Grace-
church st
PUGH, OSWALD PERCY, Abergavenny Oct 22 Dauncey & Co, Tredegar, Mon
ROWE, ALFRED HAMBLEY, Eton pl, Belgravia Oct 11 Barker & Son, Union et, Old
Broad st
SERLEY, HEPHEIRAH, Norwich Oct 15 Hatch, Norwich
SMITH, JAMES SAMUEL, Fulham Saint Mary Magdalen, Norfolk, Farmer Oct 16 Keith
& Co, Norwich
SWINBURNE, Mr. JOHN, Hart, Newcastle upon Tyne Oct 20 Longbourne & Co, Lincoln's
Inn fields
TAYLOR, Capt ERNIE RENEOLD, North Shields Oct 25 Torr & Co, Bedford row
THOMSON, Dr. WALTER LEWIS, Derby Oct 6 Moody & Woolley, Derby
WILLIAM, ROBERT RAYMOND, Lambeth rd, Shop Fitter Oct 11 Verrall & Son,
Wooling
WHITEHEAD, JEFFREY LUDLAM BARTON, East Grinstead Nov 6 Barnes & Bernard
Basinghall st
WILLIAMS, GRIFFITH, Eristock, Denbigh, Farmer Oct 4 Giles, Ellesmere, Salop

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Sept. 14.

ALFOUNDER, GEORGE SWALE, jun, Yoxford, Suffolk Oct 18 Crook & Jones, King st.
Chesapeake
BAILEY, JOHN TRIST, Paignton, Devon Oct 23 Smith & Kenny, Paignton
BINKS, JOHN, Coverham, Yorks, Farmer Sept 30 Johnson, West Burton, Aysgarth,
50, Yorks
BLACKLOCK, CHARLES WILLIAM, Lonsdale rd, Barnes Oct 21 Fattar & Co, Man-
chester
BRESLEY, WALTER DOUGLAS, Bedwellty, Mon Oct 23 Hunt & Hunt, Cardiff
BOWERING, ROBERT GEORGE, Burton rd, Brixton Oct 13 Scott, Staple Inn
BRAITHWAITE, MICHAEL LLOYD, Kensington et Oct 15 Masterman & Everington,
Pan-ras In
BROWN, Capt CLAUDE WREDFORD WREDFORD, DSO, Bristol Oct 15 Jenkins & Co, Old
Jewry
BUTLIN, CHARLES, Stoke Bishop, Glos Oct 15 Parr & Butlin, Nottingham
CARDALE, MARGARET ANNA, Albury Heath, Surrey Oct 8 Hiffe & Co, Bedford row
COKE, Hon ARTHUR GEORGE, Flaunden, Chesham, Bucks Oct 31 Steadman & Co, Old
Burlington st
COOPER, ASHLEY DE BORDE, Percy rd, Shepherd's Bush Oct 14 Russell, Broadway,
Hoxley Heath
COUPE, MARY, Birkdale, Lancs Oct 14 Yates & Co, Liverpool
CRAMP, CHARLES FREDERICK, Yardley, Birmingham Oct 8 Hodgkinson, Birmingham
CUD, MAYILDA, Brighton Oct 16 Hooper, Brighton
DENMOCK, MARY ANN MOLE, Branksome, Dorset Sept 30 Trevanion & Co, Bourne
mouth
FAIRLOUGH, ROBERT JUSTICE, Liverpool, Cotton Broker Oct 31 Woolcott & Co, West
Kirby, Cheshire
FARRAR, CATHERINE SOPHIA MARKS, Knowle, Warwick Oct 29 Lane & Co, Birming-
ham

GROVE, ALFRED ERNEST, Kingston rd, Raynes Park, Surrey, Butcher Oct 19 Hamlin-
& Co, Fleet st
HEYWOOD, FRANK, Levenshulme, Lancs, Fruit Salesman Oct 23 Heath & Sons, Mans
chester
JENKINS, JANE ELIZABETH, Penarth, Glam Oct 30 Jenkins, Newport
JONES, WALTER, Helsby, Chester, Commercial Traveller Oct 16 Walker, Man-
chester
LITTLE, JOHN, Newton by Frodsham, Chester, Builder Sept 25 Linaker & Linaker,
Runcorn
LUCAS, Sir ARTHUR CHARLES, Bart Oct 15 Hunter & Haynes, New sq
MACIVER, ANDREW TUCKER SQUAREY, Liverpool Oct 18 Cameron & Co, Liverpool
PATTISON, JAMES CHARLES, Stapleton Hall rd, Stroud Green Oct 22 Fox, Finsbury
ct, Finsbury pvt
POWELL, JAMES, Whitstable, Kent Oct 18 Martin, Goldhall chmbrs
REYNOLDS, HERO, Peckham rd Oct 11 Pothecary & Co, Gresham bldgs
SMITH, REBECCA, Anderley, Kent Oct 16 Fommet & Son, Gresham st
THOMAS, SARAH FRANCES, Ferne Park rd, Hornsey Oct 11 Wedlake & Co, Serjeants'
Inn
VANDERBILT ALFRED GWYNNE, New York City, USA Nov 9 Webb-Ware, Tavistock
st, Covent Garden
VERINI, ELIZA, Saltburn by the Sea, Yorks Oct 15 Jackson & Jackson, Middlesbrough
WATSWORTH, BENJAMIN, Eiland, Yorks, Cotton Doubler Nov 1 Garsed, Eiland
WATKINSON, JOSEPH CHARLES EDWARD MARY JOHN REGINALD, Arlesay, Bedford Oct 20
Hitham & Co, Gray's Inn sq
WHELEY, ANN ALICE, Great Hart, Staffs Oct 15 Blakemore, Birmingham
WILKINSON, ELIZABETH CHARLOTTE, Derby Oct 11 Grettton, Derby
WOODROO, BENJAMIN, Euxton, Batter Oct 21 Farnar & Co, Manchester
WRAO, WILLIAM FIDELING, Leeds, Engineer's Fitter Oct 10 Granger & Nield, Leeds
YONGE, Rev LYTTELTON VERNON, Waters Upton, DE Wellington, Salop Oct 10 Minor
& Co, Manchester

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette—FRIDAY, Sept. 3.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BERNSTEIN, ISIDORE JULIUS, Manchester, Foreign Stamp
Dealer Manchester Pet July 29 Ord Aug 31
BIGLAND, GEORGE BELAMY, Bromley, Kent Croydon Pet
Aug 9 Ord Aug 31
BOX, FRANK EDWARD, Beckenham, Kent, Nurseryman
Croydon Pet Aug 28 Ord Aug 28
CAIRNS, GLEN, Bexhill on Sea, Upholsterer Hastings
Pet Aug 30 Ord Aug 30
DERBYSHIRE, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Levenshulme, Man-
chester, Cotton Spinner Manchester Pet Aug 5 Ord
Sept 1
EDMONDSON, JAMES, Heaton Moor, Lancs Stockport
Pet Aug 13 Ord Aug 31
FLANNING, MARY GERTRUDE, Ticehurst, Sussex Tunbridge
Wells Pet Aug 27 Ord Aug 27
GARDNER, EDWARD, Headcorn, Kent, Baker Maidstone
Pet Aug 18 Ord Aug 31
GUNNEY, JAMES WARREN, Ashton, Helston, Cornwall,
Builder Truro Pet Aug 3 Ord Sept 1
HOLT, RICHARD, Milnrow, nr Rochdale, Farmer Rochdale
Pet Aug 28 Ord Aug 28
LYONS, H, Museum st, Government Contractor High
Court Pet July 7 Ord Sept 1
PATRICK, JAMES ARTHUR, York rd, Lambeth High Court
Pet Jan 25 Ord Sept 1
PERRIS, FREDERICK CHARLES, Piddletrenthide, Dorset,
General Labourer Dorchester Pet Sept 1 Ord
Sept 1
RADCLIFFE, NATHANIEL, Wastrik, Brighouse, Yorks,
Licensed Victualler Halifax Pet Aug 13 Ord Sept 1
ROBINSON, JOSEPH HENRY, Leeds, Maltster Leeds Pet
Aug 30 Ord Aug 30
SIDES, ARTHUR, Bootle, Lancs, Pork Butcher Liverpool
Pet Aug 30 Ord Aug 30
STRONG, GEORGE, Tanton, Baker Tanton Pet Aug 31
Ord Aug 31

ADJUDICATION ANNULLLED.

WRIGHT, ELIZABETH HARRIETT, Old Fleeton, nr Peter-
borough Peterborough Adjud Sept 30, 1912 Annul
July 30, 1915

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Sept. 7.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BRILSFORD, SAMUEL, Hady, Calow, Chesterfield, Joiner
Chesterfield Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 2
BROWN, SAMUEL, Liverpool, Taxi Cab Proprietor Liver-
pool Pet Aug 11 Ord Sept 2
BUTTERFIELD, SIDNEY, Goff's Oak, Herts Edmonton Pet
July 21 Ord Aug 25
CARE, ARTHUR, Cape Hill, nr Birmingham, Grocer West
Bromwich Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 2
EVANS, JOHN P, Wood, Glam, Collier Cardiff Pet Sept 2
Ord Sept 2
FIRTH, HARRIET ROSINA, Sheffield Sheffield Pet Sept 3
Ord Sept 3
HARRIS, SAMUEL, Clifton gdns, Golder's Green, Music Hall
Artist High Court Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 3
HEMSWORTH, THOMAS HENRY, Grimaby, Hotel Manager
Scarborough Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 3
HILL, ALBERT SMITH, Whalley Range, Manchester, Film
Company's Manager Salford Pet Aug 21 Ord
Sept 2
JONES BROTHERS, Oakwood st, Kensington, Builders High
Court Pet July 13 Ord Sept 3
JONES, ELLIS, Tonypany, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Sept
2 Ord Sept 2
KENNEDY, JOHN, St Leonards on Sea, Dyer Hastings Pet
Sept 3 Ord Sept 3
RICHARDSON, HARRY, Hooley Hill, Lancaster, Ironfounder
Ashton under Lyne Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
ROWETT, WILLIAM, Oxford Circus av, Blouse Manufacturer
High Court Pet June 30 Ord Sept 2
SMITH, J STANLEY, Grove Hill, South Woodford, Printer
High Court Pet July 30 Ord Sept 2
WALKER, JOHN MILTHORP, Doncaster, Tailor Sheffield
Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 3
WHITWORTH, GORDON, Bath Bath Pet Aug 30 Ord
Sept 3

FIRST MEETINGS.

BLACKWELL, JOHN WILLIAM, Hingham, Norfolk, Grocer
Sept 14 at 3.30 Off Rec, & King st, Norwich
BOX, FRANK EDWARD, Beckenham, Nurseryman Sept 14
at 11.30 York rd, Westminster Bridge rd
BUTTERFIELD, SIDNEY, Goff's Oak, Herts Sept 15 at 11
14, Bedford row

CHANNING, WILLIAM K, Dartmouth, Baker Sept 14 at
3.15 7, Buckland terr, Plymouth
EDMONSON, JAMES, Heaton Moor, Lancs Sept 17 at 11
Off Rec, Castle chmbrs, & Vernon st, Stockport
EVANS, JOHN, Pencoted, Glam, Collier Sept 16 at 12 Off
Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff
HARRIS, SAMUEL, Clifton gdns, Golder's Green, Music Hall
Artist Sept 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
JONES BROTHERS, Oakwood st, Kensington, Builders Sept
15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
JONES, ELLIS, Tonypany, Grocer Sept 17 at 11.15 Off
Rec, St Catherine's chmbrs, St Catherine st, Ponty-
pridd
LEATHERY, WILLIAM HENRY, Devonport, Baker Sept 15
at 3.15 7, Buckland terr, Plymouth
MAYN, GEORGE THOMAS, Wisbech St Peter, Cambridge,
Innkeeper Sept 16 at 11.30 Court House, King's Lynn
NORMAN, CHARLES BOSWELL, St Margarets at Cliffe, Kent
Sept 17 at 11.15 Off Rec, 68A, Castle st, Canterbury
PERRIS, FREDERICK CHARLES, Piddletrenthide, Dorset
General Labourer Sept 14 at 12.30 Off Rec, City
Chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury
PORTLOCK, FRANCIS, Wotton under Edge, Glos Sept 14 at
3 Off Rec, Station rd, Gloucester
ROWETT, WILLIAM, Oxford Circus av, Blouse Manufacturer
Sept 15 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
SIDES, ARCHIE, Litherland, Fork Butcher Sept 14 at 11
Off Rec, Union Marine bldgs, 11, Dale st, Liverpool
SMITH, J STANLEY, Grove Hill, South Woodford, Printer
Sept 15 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
WALTON, EDWARD, Blackheath, Kent, Builder Sept 14 at
11.30 122, York rd, Westminster Bridge rd
WESSON, THOMAS, JUN, Leicester, Hooley Dealer Sept 16
at 3 Off Rec, 1, Berridge st, Leicester
WILLIAMSON, JOSEPH, Holmrook, Cumberland, Shoemaker
Sept 28 at 12.30 Court House, Whitehaven

ADJUDICATIONS.

BLACKWELL, JOHN WILLIAM, Hingham, Norfolk, Grocer
N wlich Pet June 30 Ord Sept 4
BRILSFORD, SAMUEL, Hady, Calow, Chesterfield, Joiner
Chesterfield Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 2
BUTTERFIELD, SIDNEY, Goff's Oak, Herts Edmonton Pet
July 21 Ord Aug 30
CARE, ARTHUR, Cape Hill, nr Birmingham, Grocer West
Bromwich Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 2
EVANS, JOHN, Pencoted, Glam, Collier Cardiff Pet Sept
2 Ord Sept 2

THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

LICENSES INSURANCE.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 750 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.
Suitable Clauses for insertion in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

POOLING INSURANCE.

The Corporation also insures risks in connection with FIRE, CONSEQUENTIAL LOSS, BURGLARY, WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION, FIDELITY GUARANTEE, THIRD PARTY, &c., under a perfected Profit-sharing system.

APPLY FOR PROSPECTUS

FIRTH, HARRIET ROSINA, Sheffield Sheffield Pet Sept 3
Ord Sept 3

GENGE, HAROLD WILLIAM, Coleman st, Solicitor High
Court Pet April 23 Ord Sept 3
GINNETT, FREDERICK EMILE, East Finchley, Circus Pro-
prietor Barnet Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 4

HARRIS, SAMUEL, Clifton gdns, Golden's Green, Music Hal
Artist High Court Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 3

HAWDON, ARTHUR FARADAY, Gosforth, Northumberland
Electrical Engineer Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Aug 5
Ord Sept 2

HEMSWORTH, THOMAS HENRY, Grimsby, Hotel Manager
Scarborough Pet Sept 3 Ord Sept 2

JONES, ELLER, Tonyandy, Grocer Pontypridd Pet Sept
3 Ord Sept 2

RICHARDSON, HARRY, Holey Hill, Lanes, Ironfounder
Ashton under Lyne Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

ROWETT, WILLIAM, Oxford Circus, Blouse Manufacturer
High Court Pet June 30 Ord Sept 4

SHAW, M. St James' sq High Court Pet Mar 21 Ord
Sept 2

WALKER, F. D, Regent st High Court Pet July 20 Ord
Sept 2

WALKER, JOE MILTHORP, Doncaster, Tailor Sheffield Pet
Sept 3 Ord Sept 3

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept. 10.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, JAMES, Castelford, Journeyman Painter Wake-
field Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

ALLSOP, WILLIAM, Lakenheath, Suffolk Bury St Edmunds
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

ARMSTRONG, JAMES, Sheffield, Butcher Sheffield Pet
Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

BIRCHER, WILLIAM, Skewen, Glam, Baker Neath Pet
Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

BULL, F. W, Churchfield rd, Acton Brentford Pet July 27
Ord Sept 6

EVANS, ALBERT WAKELEY, New Tredgar, Mon, Iron-
monger Tredgar Pet July 24 Ord Sept 6

EVANS, WILLIAM HENRY, Guildford, Carver Guildford
Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

FENN, JOHN, Lowestoft, Publican Great Yarmouth Pet
Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

FLETCHER, RICHARD, Blackburn, China Merchant Black-
burn Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 6

HANDFORD, JAMES WILSON, Alrewas, Stafford, Plumber
Walsall Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

HARFORD, JAMES STUART, Mowbray Bishop, Devon High
Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

HATTERSLEY, GEORGE HENRY, Sheffield, Dairyman
Sheffield Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

HERON, HARRY, Halifax, Fish and Fruit Dealer Halifax
Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

HUNTER, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Scarborough, Baker Scar-
borough Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

KNAFMAN, HENRY, Llandaff North, Glam, Baker Cardiff
Pet April 19 Ord Sept 3

KONTILI, DAVID, and SOLOMON KONTILI, Southend on Sea,
Chelmsford Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

LINDSAY, WILLIAM MONTGOMERY CONYERS, Clifton gdns,
Maida Vale, Gentleman High Court Pet July 15
Ord Sept 8

MADSON, WILLIAM JOHN, Parkstone, Dorset, Coal Dealer
Poole Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

MARTIN, ARTHUR, Chislehurst, Kent, Upholsterer Croydon
Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

PEDDIE, JOHN TAYLOR, Aldwych Site, Strand, Mechanical
Engineer High Court Pet July 24 Ord Sept 8

PALMER, HOWARD WARREN, Birmingham, Gramophone
Dealer Birmingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

PARRIS, ALFRED, East Hoathly, Sussex, Baker Lewes
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

PINNIGER, EDWIN GEORGE, Bristol Bristol Pet Sept 6
Ord Sept 6

REYNOLDS, THOMAS, Rushall, Stafford, Leather Worker
Walsall Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

SAMSON, PHILIP, Crumlin, Mon, Outfitter Newport, Mon
Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

SAUL, JOSEPH, Southport, Auctioneer Liverpool Pet Aug
10 Ord Sept 7

SCHOLLES, MARTIN VALENTINE, Little rd, Fulham, Baker
High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

STRAW, CHARLES, Clowne, Derby, General Dealer Shef-
field Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

WELLS, PERCY CHARLES, Fairlee Villa Dairy, nr Newport,
I of W, Dairyman Newport Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

FIRST MEETINGS.

BERNSTEIN, ISIDORE JULIUS, Manchester, Foreign Stamp
Dealer Sept 17 at 3 Off Rec, Hyrum st, Manchester

EVANS, WILLIAM HENRY, Guildford, Carver Sept 20 at 11
132, York rd, Westminster Bridge rd

GUNDREY, JAMES WEARNE, Ashton, Helston, Cornwall,
Builder Sept 21 at 12 Off Rec, 12, Princes st Truro

HANDFORD, JAMES WILSON, Alrewas, Stafford, Plumber
Sept 22 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Lichfield st, Wolverhampton

HARFORD, JAMES STUART, Mowbray Bishop, Devon Sept
20 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

HERON, HARRY, Halifax, Fish Dealer Sept 17 at 11
County Court House, Prescott at, Halifax

HILL, ALBERT SMITH, Manchester, Film Company's
Manager Sept 17 at 3.30 Off Rec, Hyrum st, Man-
chester

KINNIS, JOHN, St Leonards on Sea Dyer Sept 17 at 2.30
Off Rec, 12A, Marlborough pl, Brighton

KNAFMAN, HENRY, Llandaff North, Glam, Baker Sept 20
at 3 Off Rec, 117, St Mary st, Cardiff

LINDSAY, WILLIAM MONTGOMERY CONYERS, Clifton gdns,
Maida Vale Sept 19 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs
Carey st

MADSON, WILLIAM JOHN, Parkstone, Dorset, Coal Dealer
Sept 20 at 2.30 100, High st (first floor), Poole

PEDDIE, JOHN TAYLOR, Aldwych Site, Strand, Mechanical
Engineer Sept 22 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

REYNOLDS, THOMAS, Rushall, Staffs, Leather Worker
Sept 21 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Lichfield st, Wolverhampton

SCHOLLES, MARTIN VALENTINE, Little rd, Fulham, Baker
Sept 22 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

STRONG, GEORGE, Taunton, Foker Sept 23 at 3.15 2,
Hammet st, Taunton

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, JAMES, Castelford, Journeyman Painter Wakefield
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

ALLSOP, WILLIAM, Lakenheath, Suffolk Bury St Edmunds
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

ANDREWS, FRANK MILLS, Great Cumberland pl, Hyde
Park High Court Pet Feb 23 Ord Sept 6

ARMSTRONG, JAMES, Sheffield, Butcher Sheffield Pet
Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

BIRCHER, WILLIAM, Skewen, Glam, Baker Neath Pet
Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

BROWN, SAMUEL, Liverpool, Taxi Cab Proprietor Liverpool
Pet Aug 11 Ord Sept 6

FENN, JOHN, Lowestoft, Publican Great Yarmouth Pet
Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

PINNIGER, EDWIN GEORGE, Bristol Bristol Pet Sept 6
Ord Sept 6

HANDFORD, JAMES WILSON, Alrewas, Stafford, Plumber
Walsall Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

HATTERSLEY, GEORGE HENRY, Sheffield, Dairyman
Sheffield Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

HERON, HARRY, Halifax, Fish and Fruit Dealer Halifax
Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

HUNTER, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Scarborough, Baker High
Court Pet June 30 Ord Sept 7

HUNTER, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Scarborough, Baker
Scarborough Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

HUNTLEY, DOUGLAS EVELYN KINGSLEY, Jermyn st High
Court Pet April 28 Ord Sept 8

MADSON, WILLIAM JOHN, Parkstone, Dorset, Coal Dealer
Poole Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

MARTIN, ARTHUR, Sidcup, Kent, Upholsterer Croydon
Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

MAURER, HENRY JOSEF, Market ter, Taylors lane, Willes-
den Baker High Court Pet June 26 Ord Sept 9

PALMER, HOWARD WARREN, Birmingham, Gramophone
Dealer Birmingham Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

PRING, THOMAS HARRY RATCLIFFE, and HENRY PERCY
THOMPSON, Norfolk st, Strand High Court Pet May
18 Ord Sept 8

REYNOLDS, THOMAS, Rushall, Staffs, Leather Worker
Walsall Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 6

SAMSON, PHILIP, Crumlin, Mon, Outfitter Newport, Mon
Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

SAUL, JOSEPH, Southport, Auctioneer Liverpool Pet Aug
10 Ord Sept 7

SCHOLLES, MARTIN VALENTINE, Little rd, Fulham, Baker
High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

SIMPSON, JOHN, Hampton Wick, Middx High Court Pet
July 29 Ord Sept 8

STRAW, CHARLES, Clowne, Derby, Miner Sheffield Pet
Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

WALTON, EDWARD, Hockheath, Kent, Builder Gre nwich
Pet July 7 Ord Sept 7

WELLS, PERCY CHARLES, Fairlee Villa Dairy, nr Newport,
I of W, Dairyman Newport Pet Sept 8 Ord
Sept 8

Amended Notice substituted for that published in
the London Gazette of July 25, 1913:

GOLDMANN, BENJAMIN, Great Eastern st, Shoreditch
Fancy Goods Merchant High Court Pet July 4 Ord
July 23

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 14.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

CONYERS, FREDERICK, Leeds, Cabinet Maker Leeds Pet
Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

FOSTER, WILLIE, Selby, Yorks, Builder York Pet Sept
10 Ord Sept 10

GIBBONS, CHARLES, Rosebery av, East Ham, Blacksmith
High Court Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 10

HALL, AMOS GEORGE, West Bridgford, Notts, Builder's
Merchant Nottingham Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 8

HARRIS, EDWARD, Wilson st, Finsbury, Timber Merchant
High Court Pet Aug 14 Ord Sept 10

HARRISON, WILLIAM and EBNESZER LITTLE GREGORY,
Liverpool, Timber Merchants Liverpool Pet Sept 10
Ord Sept 10

JACKSON, CHARLES HADDON, Lincoln, Tailor Lincoln Pet
Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

KEY, ERNEST BERTRAM TILBURY, Kemps Corner, Wye,
Kent, Nurseryman Canterbury Pet Sept 10 Ord
Sept 10

LEWIS, EDWIN CLINTON, Fallowfield, Manchester, Picture
Theatre Manager Manchester Pet Sept 11 Ord
Sept 11

LEWIS, LORENZO, Oswestry, Stonemason Wrexham Pet
Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

OST, WILLIAM HARR, Faversham, Baker Canterbury Pet
Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

RIGGS, THOMAS HAMILTON, Pannal Ash, Yorks, Engineer
Saleman York Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

ROCKETT, H. D, Grindlesford, Derby, Bank Manager Derby
Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 10

FIRST MEETINGS.

ADAMS, JAMES, Castelford, Yorks, Journeyman Painter
Sept 22 at 11 Off Rec, 21, King st, Wakefield

ARMSTRONG, JAMES, Sheffield, Butcher Sept 21 at 12 Off
Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield

BARRY, HUBERT, Salisbury Sept 21 at 1.30 Off Rec, City
chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury

BIRCHER, WILLIAM, Skewen, Glam, Baker Sept 22 at 11
Off Rec, Government bldgs, St Mary st, Swansea

BRALSFORD, SAMUEL, Hadly, Calow, Chas crdell, Joiner
Sept 22 at 12 Station Hotel, Chesterfield

BROWN, SAMUEL, Liverpool, Taxicab Proprietor Sept 21
at 11 Off Rec, Union Marine bldgs, 11, Dale st, Liver-
pool

CARE, ARTHUR, Cape Hill, nr Birmingham, Grocer Sept
22 at 11.30 Ruskin chmbrs, 191, Corporation st, Bir-
mingham

DERRYSHERK, FRANCIS WILLIAM, Livershulme, Man-
chester Cotton Spinner Sept 22 at 3 Off Rec,
Hyrum st, Manchester

FIRTH, HARRIET ROSINA, Sheffield Sept 21 at 11.30 Off
Rec, Figtree ln, Sheffield

FOSTER, WILLIE, Selby, Yorks, Builder Sept 24 at 3.30
Off Rec, Red House, Dancombe pl, York

GIBBONS, CHARLES, Rosebery av, East Ham, Blacksmith
Sept 23 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

GINNETT, FREDERICK EMILE, East Finchley, Circus Pro-
prietor Sept 21 at 11 14, Bedford row

HARRIS, EDWARD, Wilson st, Finsbury, Timber Merch at
Sept 23 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

MARTIN, ARTHUR, Sidcup, Kent, Upholsterer Sept 21 at
11 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge rd

PALMER, HOWARD WARREN, Birmingham, Gramophone
Dealer Sept 24 at 11.30 Ruskin chmbrs 191, Corpora-
tion st, Birmingham

PARRIS, ALFRED, East Hoathly, Sussex, Baker Sept 22
at 2.30 Off Rec, 12A, Marlborough pl, Brighton

PINNIGER, EDWIN GEORGE, Bristol Bristol Sept 22 at 11.45
Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

RIGGS, THOMAS HAMILTON, Pannal Ash, Yorks, Engineer
Saleman Sept 24 at 3 Off Rec, The Red House, Dun-
combe pl, York

WELLS, PERCY CHARLES, nr Newport, Isle of Wight
Dairyman Sept 23 at 11 Off Rec, 98, High st, New-
port, Isle of Wight

WHITWORTH, GORDON PENTY-CROSS, Bath Sept 22 at
11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol

ADJUDICATIONS.

STON, WILLIAM, and MARY FRANCES KATHLEEN ASTON,
Birmingham Worcester Pet July 10 Ord Sept 11

CONYERS, FREDERICK, Leeds, Wholesale Cabinet Maker
Leeds Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

EVANS, WILLIAM HENRY, Guildford, Carver and Gilder
Guildford Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 9

FABRE, MARIE HENRIETTE HABRIOUX, Paris High
Court Pet June 21 Ord Sept 8

FLETCHER, JOHN RICHARD, Blackburn, China Merchant
Blackburn Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 10

FOSTER, WILLIE, Selby, Yorks, Builder York Pet Sept
10 Ord Sept 10

HALL, AMOS GEORGE, West Bridgford, Notts, Builder's
Merchant Nottingham Pet Aug 27 Ord Sept 10

HILL, ALBERT SMITH, Manchester, Film Company's Man-
ager Salford Pet Aug 21 Ord Sept 9

JACKSON, CHARLES HADDON, Lincoln, Tailor Lincoln
Pet Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

JOHNSON, JOHN GROVE, Morpeth mans, London High
Court Pet July 1 Ord Sept 10

KEY, ERNEST BERTRAM TILBURY, Kemp's Corner, Wye,
Kent, Nurseryman Canterbury Pet Sept 10 Ord
Sept 10

KNAFMAN, HENRY, Llandaff North, Glam, Baker Cardiff
Pet April 19 Ord Sept 9

LEWIS, EDWIN CLINTON, Fallowfield, Manchester, Picture
Theatre Manager Manchester Pet Sept 11 Ord
Sept 11

LEWIS, LORENZO, Oswestry, Stonemason Wrexham Pet
Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

OST, WILLIAM HARR, Faversham, Baker Canterbury Pet
Sept 10 Ord Sept 10

PARRIS, ALFRED, East Hoathly, Sussex, Baker Lewes
Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 11

RIGGS, THOMAS HAMILTON, Pannal Ash, Yorks, Engineer
Saleman York Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

SKINN, ARCHIBALD PERCIVAL, Newcastle upon Tyne,
Motor Car Agent Newcastle upon Tyne Pet Aug 9
Ord Sept 11

WHITWORTH, GORDON PENTY-CROSS, Fallowfield, Bath Bath
Pet Aug 20 Ord Sept 9

-
ure
Ord
Pet
Pet
ner
rby

nter
Off
City
t 11
iner
t 21
ver-
Sept
Bir-
an-
Rec,
Off
3.30
nith
Pro-
n nt
el at
one
ora-
t 22
Off
ner
Dun-
ight
New-
2 at

ron,
11
akw
lder
High
hant
Sept
der's
0
ans-
acolu
High
Wre,
Ord
ardiff
cture
Ord
Pet
P. t
Lew
incer
Tyne,
Aug 9
Bath